THE MUSLIM WORLD

VOL. XL JANUARY, 1950 No. 1

A CHANGE OF EMPHASIS

I have been asked to write down some of my impressions and convictions in regard to mission service after forty years of experience in work among Muslims in Persia. If I were given again the privilege of taking the Gospel to the Muslim world or to any other part of the non-Christian world, the changes which my past experiences suggest would be changes not of policy but rather of emphasis which, I believe, would bring our work more into harmony with the purpose of Christ and would result in greater fruitfulness.

The first change is a change from emphasis on the need of human leadership to a new loyalty to the leadership of Christ. There seems to be today an anxious quest for some Saul who stands head and shoulders above all others in administrative ability who could lead the church to victory and make us to be like the other sects of Christendom. Christ knew that this temptation would come to the disciples and their followers and therefore He said in Matt.23:10, "Nor must you be called 'leaders,' for One is your leader, even the Christ" (Moffatt's translation). Notwithstanding these words, some in the church are not averse to being called leaders and others are pushing forward their favorites as religious leaders. It is true that Christians need a leader but we have the greatest Leader the world has ever known. Would not some of the divisions in the church be avoided if we would follow the exhortation of the Apostle Paul, "Let no man glory in men."

Again, there is needed a change of emphasis from money to life. We know that the work of the church cannot be carried on without the use of money. But we know also that it cannot be carried on successfully with money alone, or even with money as the chief factor. When the emphasis is put upon the consecration of life, it includes money, prayer and a life that can pray. We are told that the contributions to the church are so inadequate at the present time compared with the need that a less emphasis upon money would be disastrous. I do not believe that the amount of money given will

ever be adequate until the emphasis is put upon the consecration of life not only on the part of those who go but also on the part of those who remain at home and support those who go. It is true that there was a time when Christians were more ready to offer long prayers on behalf of Foreign Missions than they were to support the cause by giving sacrificially. Later we were told that money is the "acid test"; but there can be only one acid test which is a consecrated life. This life includes giving, prayer and living in the spirit of Christ. Giving cannot be a substitute for living nor release a person from the duty of living a Christ-like life. "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold . . . but with the precious blood of Christ." Nor is the giving of money necessarily the first step toward the consecration of life. It is often a silencer of the conscience for not living a Christ-like life. A secular magazine stated recently that while it may be difficult for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of heaven, it is certainly not difficult for him to secure an office in the church. The spiritual life on the mission field will rise to a higher level only when the spiritual life of the church at home is raised. The missionaries on the field come from the home church.

Another suggested change is from emphasis on publicity to emphasis on witnessing. There is a difference. The Apostolic church was a witnessing church and it often received more publicity than it desired. Our Lord often withdrew from the multitude in order to avoid publicity but "He could not be hid." By witnessing, we do not mean witnessing by word alone or by deed alone but, as has been well said, by "word and deed." Today we are asking why the church is not exerting a greater influence upon the world. Perhaps it is because the world is exerting too great an influence upon the church. We wonder why the world does not seek the guidance of the church in the solution of its problems. May it not be because the church follows too frequently the methods of the world in the solution of its problems.

Again, it is my conviction that personality is more important than policy. There has been an increased emphasis on mission policy in recent years due to the belief that the

paucity of results in proportion to the personnel and money expended is attributable primarily to wrong or faulty policies. It is true that we need the best policies possible and our present policies should be examined for improvement and adaptation to changing conditions. But after all, our fruitfulness as missionaries depends more upon what we are than upon our methods. The spirit of St. Paul had more to do with his success than his methods and his methods were subject to change with changing conditions. One may go to the foreign field and imitate the methods of St. Paul and still be a failure but no one can go to the foreign field in the spirit of St. Paul and be a failure. Those of us who are tempted to emphasize the importance of numbers can learn a lesson from the story of Gideon and his three hundred men.

Much of the teaching of the New Testament is a call to a change of emphasis. Christ said to Martha, "Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things: But one thing is needful." His call to the multitude was, "Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? . . . But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." The Apostles after Pentecost found a change of emphasis necessary. They said, "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables . . . But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word." . . . "And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly." The Apostle Paul refers to his change of emphasis in a striking passage. "But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. . . . That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."

Today there is a call for a change of emphasis. We have the machinery for a forward movement but we lack spiritual power. We have the needed organization. Can it be turned into an organism? The New Life movement is a call to a new emphasis. May we heed that call!

CHARLES R. PITTMAN

Pasadena, California

When we are dealing with millions of people, we are gravely in danger of straying from missionary values, one of the most important of which is to emphasize the value of every single soul when measured in the values of the Cross. During my thirty-nine years in India I was often appalled at myself, along with other missionaries and their Boards, Indian Christians and their Churches, becoming *so* absorbed in the baffling problems of 255 (?) millions of Hindus that equally baffling problems affecting one hundred (?) million Muslims could so easily be overlooked. On this many of us learned a lesson we have never forgotten from a few simple elementary questions that the veteran Dr. Zwemer once asked the Bombay Missionary Conference about Muslims in our own part of India and the stupefying ignorance we *all* displayed.

That the Staff of the Henry Martyn School is wide awake to all the implications of recent revolutionary changes, as these affect the work of Christ in India and Pakistan, is clear from Dr. Donaldson's words in THE MUSLIM WORLD of April 1948 that "some ask" whether "the Henry Martyn School should go and concentrate its efforts in Pakistan," on which the learned Principal states: "The staff and the Committee of Management of this institution gave much thought to this question," and on the whole after balancing various considerations, "it was recognized that probably the division of India had greatly augmented opportunities for evangelism among the . . . Muslims who still remain in the India Union. All were agreed that in work for Muslims there is very great need for groups of trained workers in each of the two Dominions." This will bring comfort to many.

These lines are directed mainly to two classes of readers, those who specialize in evangelizing the Muslims of India and Pakistan, and those working among the non-Muslim remainder of Indian and Pakistani millions. During the last two decades of my own work in India the conviction slowly deepened that the Church of Christ in India, made up as it

is mainly of former Hindus, *needs for its own sake* to undertake far more systematically and methodically the saving of the Muslim millions who live by their side. A personal reference may be pardoned. After I had been in charge for several years of the United Theological College of Western India in Poona, daily contact with successive classes of students brought home to me their almost complete ignorance of the various Muslim problems among the nearly thirty millions of Marathi-speaking people, despite the presence of over four and a half million Muslims in the Bombay Presidency of that time. In view of the lamented absence of any textbook in Marathi on the subject I concluded the only way to solve the problem of my own duty was to add the subject to the curriculum and prepare the needed textbook, *The Call Of Jesus Christ To Our Muslim Brethren* (90 pages, published in 1939). On the basis of my own experience of the relations between Hindus and Muslims I concentrated in my last three of the nine chapters on showing what a unique opportunity the converted Hindu has of practising the spirit of Jesus towards the Muslim, and thus of winning him for Christ.

Since that little book was published there has taken place the vast Indian revolution, followed by the agony suffered by millions of refugees with their indescribable and uncountable sorrows. The harvest of hate and estrangement left behind is now being intensified by the Hindu revival represented by the return to the political field of the militant Hindu Mahasabha which for over a year had imposed upon itself the self-denying ordinance of silence which lasted until the case against the Rashtriya Seva Sangh in connection with Gandhiji's wicked assassination had been disposed of. There surely never was in history a Church presented with a more golden opportunity of preaching the evangel of Infinite Love and of practising Christ-like virtues than that offering itself to the Indian Church of our day. Thank God that the Indian Church has grasped the opportunity with both hands through its doctors and nurses and many other helpers. The point that needs now to be realized is

that an even greater opportunity presents itself of India's Christians pouring into the already open and grateful heart of Muslims and Hindus in Pakistan and India the wonderful message of God's saving Love In Christ.

The space generously offered me in the editor's letter is more than exhausted. The story is told that during the British Cabinet mission to India in 1946, Sir Stafford Cripps was so overwhelmed with India's problem that he asked where the nearest Sunday worship service was being held and when he was told it would be in a Quakers' Meeting he attended it. All eyes upon him as to what he would say, Sir Stafford stood up to pray and said, in words to this effect: "O God, show us Thy way through all the terrible misunderstanding in India." God has surely answered that prayer at least in part, by showing to His children in India's Church the simple way of Christ-like service to a suffering India. Now He wants by His Patient Loving Spirit to inspire in the heart of His Church in that distracted land the wisdom and love and power to proclaim to the open mind and heart of India and Pakistan that message of mediation seen in the Cross of His Loving Son. *"In Him is our peace"* were the words at the foot of the only picture we are told Gandhiji had in his Sevagram hut, and that was the picture of Jesus: "In *Him* is *our* peace."

J. F. EDWARDS

Auburndale, Mass.

FOUNDATIONS—FROM CHINESE ISLAM

We speak of North Africa as "The Land of the Vanished Church"; Christianity was once a recognized religion of China!

The Roman Emperor Severus placed the image of Christ among the gods of his oratory; the Chinese Emperor Tai Tsung (the Great), according to the Nestorian tablet, took another line. He ordered that his own portrait be painted in the first monastery built in China. Imperial patronage had, no doubt, its share in undermining the faith of those who might have stood firm in persecution. However that may be, the Church gradually disappears from Chinese history.

We hear, in the 16th Century, of Churches which had become idol-temples. The children of those who had only worshipped the Queen of Heaven (first as Mary and then as Kwan-yin) were soon lost to sight among the idolators around them.

Another change we can trace if we search official notes, study old buildings and listen to traditions. Instead of a living faith in the God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ —revealed by the Son through the Spirit—there were Christians who opposed idolatry with "There is no God but the one God." Forgetting every other essential they, with the Jews of China, gradually came to accept the creed of the greater number of monotheists about them; "There is no God but God, *and* Muhammad is His Apostle."

So the missionaries of later centuries found, with the "three religions" of the majority, Islam as the comprehensive "fourth religion" in China, and the too few who have sought the peace of the ex-Muslim quarter of the New Jerusalem are grieved to see walls once built now in ruins. Their enemies cry, "Even that which they build, if a fox go up, he shall break down their stone wall." In China, at least, this seems so true that we become discouraged until we read Revelation XXI and those verses of hope, Isaiah LIV:11,12. Then we see the foundations of precious stones, laid in the Rock and know the walls are safe and that the ruby windows shall yet be prepared to shine with Light from the central

pinnacle towards which every quarter of the city looks, "for the Lamb is the Light thereof."

I. Here is a sapphire foundation stone excavated into that Christian school or into contact with one of the Christian unions now found in Government schools. We have heard of girls as well as boys who were sent to a non-Muslim school to get the education modern China demands. They were "safe," thought their parents, no Muslim would change Islam for another religion. A very few we know have come out for Christ; of others we have the sure and certain hope which sees them "safe" in the true sense. The majority of Muslims found in the visible church have passed through Christian schools; some were at the time apparently untouched by the Love of God in Christ but could not forget it in later life.

II. This precious stone was tossed by sickness into a Christian hospital. One patient here, one there—on one happy occasion five in a day—took the step of open baptism. We can seldom trace their future unless as lepers they *must* stay, or employed in the hospital, they *can* stay there. Most are made to vanish; poison, mind destroying drugs, or simply locked doors, hide them from us.

III. Another, our eyes cannot yet read the name written on it, for the one who first gave a Scripture portion, dynamite of the Word of Life, does not know that he is responsible for the freeing of this precious stone from its rock prison. It may be that a whole cliff has been loosened and the gems exposed to be gathered, polished and set in years to come. Often the Book might have been cast aside but for a few words in the "Sacred Arabic" on its cover. I myself had an Arabic Bible *stolen* by an Ahung who had proved his understanding of the language by translating wall-texts to soldiers, for he was "Chaplain" in a Muslim Army. The later history of that man and of that Bible is unknown to the legitimate owner of the latter.

IV. And that one came from prison—for only there could the Love of God reach him. "I was in prison, and ye came

unto Me." Among those whom the King calls "My brethren" are Muslims imprisoned for political offenses, or as criminals. Abounding grace transmuted them into jewels. In a North Western prison there is a Christian jailer. He realizes that prisoners will say anything to please him but even so, he has seen in some lives a change which makes him sure that they are "born again," among them Muslims. All have at least heard the Word of Life.

V. A Sunday School is responsible for touching that little rolling stone that it might fall into the Master Hand to be polished and made fit for the city of the Great King. Many a small Muslim has run in and out, refusing to mix with children from the homes of idolators, never seeming to absorb any teaching, yet some word, some phrase, some chorus, has gripped and held the heart of that restless child, held it for Eternity. The few cases of which we know encourage us to hope for many more.

VI. In a country dispensary others were gathered waiting for treatment. They could not but see the pictures on the walls, and listened almost against their wills to the explanations of these pictures. They rushed home as soon as they had secured their "foreign medicine" and the missionary sighed at the apparently wasted day, but there is a cluster of stones in the foundations gathered in that small dispensary. We know of Muslims who have at least remained friendly, willing to hear the words of Christians because of the friendliness and help of such a dispensary many years earlier.

VII. A Christian woman followed the peddler past the fierce dogs and strong walls of one of the fortified farms of the North West, or into the apparently open doors, closed by prejudice, in the South or East; a hard Muslim village nearly broke the heart of its Christian visitors first with indifference and later by boycott. From each of the three a lovely sapphire, polished by persecution, hidden on earth, shines in the great City for all Eternity. Eager faces are photographed on the films of memory; the very fact that we

were not allowed to see them more than once or twice tells us that their men folk saw or feared that they were slipping out of their hands.

VIII. Oh! what joy will come to the pioneer who has travelled far distances, who seemed at each place to clutch a precious stone, only to have it slip through his fingers. Yes joy, when he sees that those his hands could not hold no man could pluck out of the Father's hand. They have been safely carried from desert and mountain to rest beside the river of the water of life. In the far regions of Sinkiang and Tsinghai so many meet a Christian once in a lifetime. Only the Almighty God could use one meeting to shake that soul into safety.

IX. Daily preaching on the streets may draw in the sons of Han; a Muslim listens for a minute and passes on. Yet the first loosening of the clay around that precious stone you see was caused by just such drops of the water of Life. A word heard in this town to-day, perhaps by one a hundred miles away next week, will soften a heart. Preachers cannot follow to see it, for of all the merchants, pilgrims, soldiers of China, the Muslim is the greatest traveller. One man we know asked for a Bible in the far North, again in the West; now in the South West we hear that "he seems very interested, BUT. . . . ."

X. Christian literature with a special appeal to the Muslim has been prepared. To some extent—though inadequately—it has been distributed. Now by faith—one day by sight—we know that this too has broken off the prejudice which encrusted some gems when all other means failed. Not only Arabic literature is prepared by the Christian but also the language which the Muslim *speaks*. Yes, Chinese of course, but not the religious expressions used by idolators. Only by much study can such be written.

XI. Even into an ordinary Chinese Church service one or two of our precious foundation stones have tumbled, pushed by curiosity, and the Word heard has kept on rubbing—ir-

ritating—until that one is polished. In the less bigotted Muslim centres, where a woman can, like the daughters of Han, —if neither very young or very rich—go out freely and the veil is unknown, she may come to listen. Later a Christian, who has noticed, followed up and found the interested hearer, learns that it is a Muslim who came. One woman was found to have had wine poured over her clothes so that she would not dare to go on the streets with the forbidden smell upon her though in secret many a man is not so careful about Quranic rules! Such methods, or serious physical injury, may keep away the interested hearer, even if he can stand the scorn of his friends. Thus most are unseen by our eyes listening in a crowd at the back of the Church.

XII. Recently English classes have attracted some jewels and kept them in touch with the Gospel till the surface indifference was broken off. Then comes testing, cutting and polishing. There are casual observers who say that a Muslim does not suffer in these days in China. Would that it were so, but even now and even here the cutting goes deep. It is comparatively easy to confess Christ among his Chinese fellow students, but soon his own people will know; then comes the hardness.

We rejoice—we praise the great Jeweller—as we see the foundations laid. Looking back over the years one sees how much has been done—and how comparatively little it really is.

There is, in China as elsewhere, one reason for the slowness of the building. To declare himself a Christian is (for a Muslim) to step out, like Peter, on to water, leaving the safe boat of family, tradition, and all the restful memories of childhood. How often we speak of "*my* faith" or "*my* religion"; to the Muslim this new faith is like the waters of the Sea of Galilee, if he trusts himself on it and takes his eyes off the Lord who bade him come, then, like Peter, he begins to sink. He has been so sure that "everyone" (we have heard this same word from a Christian!) *everyone* must be right and this new foreign doctrine wrong.

Another problem is peculiar to a land where Islam is the faith of the minority. Christian teachers tend to speak as to heathen. Are they, the Muslim wonders, trying to turn him from faith in the True Lord (Hu-da, An-la-hu) to believe in some mix-up which denies idols and yet uses the words and phrases of the heathen? Later on to the sincere seeker comes the fear that it is a "base idea" (as one of them has written) "to depend on someone else's merit for salvation, even if that One was God Himself." How hard to see baseness in their own hope that God will forgive without considering His immutable justice and holiness! So he wavers, doubting and believing at the same time.

An Indian Muslim missionary in London once made a list of "obviously corrupted" sayings in the New Testament; among them was "Lord, I believe, help Thou my unbelief" —all who have come out from Islam to believe in the Lord Christ can tell of such a prayer, a prayer of faith and unbelief, each seeming to fill the whole heart.

It is when faith has conquered that the agonizing realization comes of what confession will mean. Can he cut himself off from all the ties of family and home? We see but half the story when we speak of his being "cast off"; to his own people it is he who has cut himself off and with fear and utter loneliness comes again the question, "Is it right?" Behind all these lines of defense comes the resort to physical force. Poison may mean death or it may mean a mind no longer able to convey the impulses of his spirit. In the latter case we may surely accept the Muslim belief that the spirit of one mentally afflicted is safe in the presence of God, but *we* hear no more of him. A woman is more speedily shut off from Christian influence. We saw some dear bright girls who seemed to drink in the Word of Life. The sign by which we were assured that they believed is—we never saw them again. On our next visit we heard, "she has gone to her mother's home" (i.e. away from her married home) or "she is sick" or, bluntly, "she died." We can but pray that such shall be kept for a place in the City where they can rejoice in reflecting the Light they turned towards on earth.

These difficulties are on the side of Muslims; let us consider the Chinese Church. Antagonism is mutual between *Han* and *Hui;* even in the Church it is hard for Chinese to trust and welcome a convert from Islam, much less will most Chinese Christians try to give their Good News to Muslim neighbors. Recently we have heard of some who heard this call. There are Chinese Christians seeking to reach the Muslim peoples of Central Asia and a few in other parts of Chinese territory.

We are apt to think this their special responsibility "the evangelization of their own people" including Chinese Muslims; perhaps we should think again. Are we foreign Christians not the ones to evangelize our "own people"? The Jesuits in the 16th Century found that the name "Hui-hui" –now used exclusively for Muslims–was a general title for three alien peoples subject to the Chinese Emperor. The symbol "ten" (+ in Chinese numerals) was still used by erstwhile Christians but to the Chinese the three were divided merely by the foods they would not eat. Christians, having apparently brought a dislike for horse, mule or donkey flesh from the west, were "men who did not eat animals with uncloven hooves"; Jews, "men who did not eat sinews" (Gen.32,32) and Muslims, "men who did not eat pork."

We need a Nehemiah to stir us up–Haggai and Zechariah to tell us that the walls must be built–that "ceiled houses," even in the spiritual realm, are not for us while this part of the House of the Lord is waste. We foreigners are more welcome to the Muslim; to the Chinese we and the Muslims of the North West and the missionaries of Islam from India or Egypt are all Westerners, with our big noses and round eyes, though our skins be pink or brown.

The Muslim is not one with his neighbour: he must be understood if he is to understand. The picture comes to mind of a group of Muslim children in a province where we are told Muslims are reached by ordinary methods. There have been converts from among them but these children hang back and will not talk to the foreigner. Near their home lives an Ahung who is watchful over his flock. They

have heard all manner of evil of the foreigner and only come in numbers which ensure safety. Then a foreign woman, with honorable white hair, asks one boy, "What is your Scripture name?" The name given by the Ahung is never used before non-Muslims, and he mutters "haven't got one." But this woman seems to know—she suggests one or two—and it soon comes out, for understanding gives confidence, no one else seemed to have heard of "Scripture names." Many another custom, small in itself, can only be learnt by living among the Muslims.

Mentioning a Muslim street in a capital city (in Central China, not in the fanatical North West), we told of our visit twenty years ago and of how children there had never seen a foreigner, though we were too common to be a spectacle in any other part of the city. A young missionary replied, "I remember going down a street where the children ran after me and there were women in black hoods at the doors of the houses." So to this day the only foreign missionaries seen in this street are from Muslim lands and come to revive Islam.

Men may have heard the Message, and one who has got through all his doubts and fears *may* take the risk of teaching his wife and family of it. Otherwise it seems as if the only way is for women—women with either husbands or white hair—to live among them and learn the way to their hearts, but when we suggest living among Muslims the cry comes from every quarter, "You wouldn't be allowed to!" "How long would they let you stay?" And from the other side, "They will come without your making a special effort." The same words were said of China a hundred years ago—and indeed there were riots, there were martyrdoms, as there may be when we wake to the need of living among and learning to know Muslim men, women and children. It was years before the Christian Church saw the need of a translation of the Bible understood by the common man when scholars had one in classical Chinese. We have not yet seen the need of telling the Truth so that the Muslim understands, nor that men and women must live right among them to learn deeply

of their thoughts and ways. Years ago we moved from a *Han* to a *Hui* district. The Chinese were afraid for us to go among the Muslims, the Muslims were glad to see us safely back after staying among the people of *Han!*

The time may be short for more reasons than one. We hear of open doors everywhere—till Communism comes in, and the Muslim, the last to be conquered by Communism, has opposed it by a strong attempt to revive Islam. Educated men are learning from the Western Muslim—Indians (often unorthodox) or Egyptians—how to replace the Christ, the Son of God, with "Jesus the Prophet." The uneducated and most of the women—yes, most, even in these days of emancipation—are being taught to fear Christian teaching more than in the past.

We must rise up and work while it is day, so that at last, whether we see them on earth or no, many shall shine like gems, nay like stars, and we who have so often failed to stand against our lesser temptations, shall be overwhelmed with adoring praise if we have had any part in the gathering of such stones for the Twelve Foundations.

Olive M. Botham

London, England

JESUS IN A PRE-ISLAMIC ARABIC INSCRIPTION*

Mr. G. Lankester Harding, Chief Curator of Antiquities Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan, kindly sent me copies of a little more than five hundred Thamudic inscriptions. These copies are by far the best and most valuable documents of that epigraphy that I know. Mr. Harding made clear photographs of these inscriptions, wherever it was possible, and made perfectly exact drawings of all the originals. Only in one case a similar reproduction has been made: it is the T. J. Meek inscription, now at Toronto, published by Professor Winnett. All the other Thamudic inscriptions published up to this time are, as far as I know, hand-made copies drawn by travellers in Arabia, often hastily made and without a knowledge of the Thamudic script. By Mr. Harding's reproductions the study of Thamudic epigraphy has been placed on an entirely new and safe basis. We know now what many of these graffiti exactly do look like. Mr. Harding also sent me careful transliterations of his inscriptions. But in one case, his no. 476, he says only: "A picture is shown of a presumably Christian mark," but does not explain the letters. It is the inscription that interests us here.

Below the circle there are four letters: they are a *y*, a *sh*, a ᶜ, and again a *y*. The Thamudic *y* is a small circle with a straight line attached to it (ϙ), the *sh* is a straight line (|), the ᶜ is a circle a little larger than the circle of the *y* (o). These letters are so placed that they can be read from right to left or from left to right *y* — *sh* — ᶜ, probably pronounced *Yashūᶜ*, and this name is the same as *Yēshūᵃᶜ*, the Hebrew form of the name of Christ. It is known that *Yēshūaᶜ* is the later pronunciation of *Yēhōshūᵃᶜ* or Joshua; it was used after the Exile in order to avoid the immediate sequence of two dark vowels (*o* and *u*). Of course, it is well known that the Christians whose language is Arabic commonly use the form *Yasūᶜ* changing *sh* to *s* in the same way as the Europeans use the *s* here, having the prototype Ἰησοῦς which

* See frontispiece.

owes its ס to the fact that the Greeks had no *sh*. But here in Thamudic the *sh* was preserved as in Christian Syriac.

Now there is in this inscription still another sign which consists of a right angle that may be a Thamudic *l*. If that is so we would have to read *l-y-sh-ᶜ*, "For Jesus," in both directions.

The curious way of writing in two directions reminds us of the wide spread symmetry—or as it is also called "bisymmetry"—in Oriental sculpture, poetry, other literature and epigraphy. In epigraphy the letters are mostly so arranged that the words run from a center to the right and to the left. Some Thamudic examples are given in my pamphlet *"Thamūd und Ṣaffa,"* pp. 90f. Some sentences from the Qur'ān may be read either from right to left or from left to right, as e.g. *rbk f kbr*. Such readings have a certain magic value. For poetical symmetry attention may be called here also to the *parallelismus membrorum* in the Psalms and in Mandaean liturgies.

But there seems to be some more magic in the circle over the name of Jesus. There is a small circle in the lower left hand part under the left half of the horizontal bar of the cross. This may be the letter ᶜ *(ᶜayin)*. Where the bars of the cross touch the surrounding main circle each time a small circle may be recognized. This small circle together with the adjoining straight line and the continuation of this line may represent the letters *y* and *sh*, and when these letters arrive at the center they meet with a *c*: so here we can read *y — sh —* ᶜ, "Jesus," four times, from the top to the center downwards, from the bottom to the center upwards, from the right end of the horizontal bar to the center, and from the left end to the center.

The whole, then, is a so-called magic circle. Magic circles and especially magic squares are very well known from Muslim literature and sometimes from Arabic epigraphy. Letters or numerals are arranged so that they can be united in different ways and always give the same word or the same sum. Doutté in his *Magie et Religion dans l'Afrique du Nord*, p. 151, says: "Par exemple, des noms de Dieu, des noms

d'anges, des noms de démons, de versets du Coran, sont dispersés en figures géométriques, répartis en carrés, décomposés en lettres."

In such a way the letters *y-sh-ᶜ* representing the ancient Arabic name of Jesus would form the contents of a "magic circle," carved on stone; and this circle would have an apotropaic value and serve to protect against Satan and evil spirits like a great many of the Christian Greek inscriptions of Syria.

The name Thamudic needs here a short explanation. It is a conventional name for a special class of pre-Islamic inscriptions found mainly in Northern Arabia and in the countries of Edom and Moab. They were at first called proto-Arabic; but this term is too general. The tribe of Thamūd or Tamud was known to the Assyrians and to the Romans; to the Muslim Arabs the Banū Thamūd were a mythical people of long ago. Their name has been chosen because it occurs as a proper name in these inscriptions, of which, however, certainly not all were carved or scratched by Thamudenes only. For the dating of these inscriptions the last centuries B.C. and the first centuries A.D. are to be considered. One inscription dates from the year 267 A.D. Our magic circle dates also from Christian times. The man who carved it was a Christian Arab who wished to invoke the benediction of Christ in an impressive way. There were Christian Arabs in the time before Muhammad, and some of their descendants still live in the country east of the Jordan. Inscription Harding No. 476 is the oldest native document of Christianity of Northern Arabia known so far.

My sincere thanks are due to Mr. Harding who kindly allowed me to make this unique document generally known before his whole collection is published: it is hoped that this will soon be possible.

Enno Littmann

Tübingen

NOTES TO ISLAMIC SOURCES ON THE SLAVS AND THE RŪS

As has been justly remarked by Minorsky, the literature of Muslim sources on the Rūs and other peoples of South Russia is enormous.[1] It is most unlikely, however, that any new sources, or newly discovered manuscripts of published works, will give additional information on South Russia. The most recent discovery of a new Muslim source was the *Ṭabā'i' al-ḥayawān* of Sharaf al-Zamān Ṭāhir al-Marvazī, an eleventh century author.[2] While little new is added to what is already known, Marvazī is now revealed as the source of many later Muslim authors who wrote on the Rūs. Another geographical text with interesting information, but perhaps of spurious authorship, is the Persian translation of the *Masālik wa'l-mamālik,* supposedly written by Jayhānī, the famous geographer and vezir of the Sāmānid amīr Naṣr ibn Aḥmad, in the first half of the tenth century.[3]

Several unused manuscripts of published works, and two published accounts of the Rūs or the Slavs, will be discussed briefly here. The first manuscript is the huge compilation of twenty-two volumes by Shihāb al-dīn Faḍlallāh al'Umarī, entitled *Masālik al-abṣār fī mamālik al-amṣār.* The author died in Damascus in 1348, after compiling this encyclopaedia, the first three volumes of which are concerned with geography. The *MSS.* in western collections are all quite fragmentary, but in the library of Aya Sofya, Istanbul, nos. 3415-39, it is preserved complete.[4] Although parts of the geographical section have been summarily translated into

[1] V. Minorsky, *Ḥudūd al-'Ālam,* (London, 1937), 432. It is perhaps presumptuous to say anything on this subject after the exhaustive studies of Minorsky, but the material for this paper was gathered in Turkey from *MSS,* which were later checked by published texts, and a few new items of interest were found.

[2] V. Minorsky, *Marvazī on China, the Turks and India,* (London, 1942), 36, 118.

[3] On this work see the note at the end of this article.

[4] The old catalogue *(defter)* of this library, printed in Istanbul in 1304/1886, is unreliable; cf. C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur,* II, 141; S II, 175-6; also Dorn in *Mélanges Asiatiques,* (St. Petersburg, 1872), 673-4, and Gaudefroy-Demombynes, (trans.) *Masālik el-Abṣār* (Paris, 1927), pp. I-II. This deals only with the countries of the west.

French, there is more information about our subject yet to be found in it.[5]

Another manuscript is the well-known *Kitāb al-mamālik wa'l masālik* of *al-Bekrī,* which was edited by Baron von Rosen and Kunik in their *Izvestiya al-Bekri i Drugikh Avtorov o Rusi i Slavyanakh,* (St. Petersburg, 1878). The new *MS* is preserved in the library of the Laleli mosque, Istanbul, and was first brought to the attention of the scholarly world by H. Ritter, who had it photographed.[6] Although this *MS* is almost identical with the published text, some of the proper names have variant readings which may clear up minor points and uncertain readings.

While in Istanbul I copied part of a *MS* of the *Jawāmi' al-ḥikāyāt* of Muḥammad 'Aufī preserved in the Nur Osmaniya mosque library, no. 3272, which has an interesting section on the Magyars, Slavs and Rūs. It was later discovered that Bartold had edited and translated the passage on the Rūs with a few notes.[7] The text published by Bartold was almost identical with the *MS* of Istanbul. Another *MS* from the India Office, London, (Persian, No. 595), however, contained a number of variants. 'Aufī's section on the Magyars and Slavs *(Saqāliba),* as well as the Rūs, is translated below.

"There is another branch of the Turks who are called Magyars. They have a large dominion, the extent of which is a hundred by a hundred *farsangs.* Whenever their chief mounts (a steed), twenty thousand horsemen mount with him. Their land is called *Kndh.*[8] They have tents and they travel with their beasts of burden. Their land [I.O. *MS*—extends until it] joins the sea of Rūm. The abode of this people is on the banks of [I.O. *MS*—two rivers], one called

[5] E. Quatremère, in *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la bibliothèque du roi,* 13 (Paris, 1838), 268-286.

[6] *Der Islam,* 19, (1931), 57.

[7] V. Bartold, "Novoye musulmanskoe izvestie o russkikh," *Zapiski Vost. Otd. Russ. Arkh. Ova.* 9, (1896), 262-7; translated in his "Arabskie Izvestiya o Rusakh," *Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie,* 1 (Moscow, 1940), 39.

[8] *Marvazī, op. cit.,* 35, says the name of the chief is **knda;* on this see *Ḥudūd al-'Ālam,* 323-324, and A. Zeki-Validi Togan, *Ibn Faḍlān's Reisebericht* (Leipzig, 1939), 260.

Wfā, and one called *Atl.*[9] They are larger than the Oxus river. They (the Magyars) continually make war on the Slavs and the Rūs, and they are always victorious over those others. They take prisoners and carry them to Rūm to be sold. They always have many advantages because of trade [I.O. *MS*—war].

"The Slavs *(Ṣaqāliba),* however, are a numerous folk. Between their land and the land where they [*sic*] are settled it is amongst many forests.[10] The land of the Pechenegs is thirteen days and nights distant, but there is no road, rather deserts and woods and springs of water. They are fire worshippers and burn human beings [*sic*—read: their dead.][11] Their fields are of millet and they have a drink (prepared from honey). Their weapons are axes and spears, and their shields are the finest. They have a chief called *Swyt* and every leader they had was called by this name.[12] The deputy is called *Swbh.* They have a town called *Khrrān,* which has a bazaar three days in every month.[13] People of the area come and buy and sell.

"The Rūs live on an island in a sea, which island is three days' journey long and the same in width.[14] On that island are trees and thickets, and the sea is all around it. They continually engage in robbery and their existence and profession are by the sword. If one of them dies and a son and daughter remain, they give all the possessions (of the defunct) to the daughter, and they give the son no more than a sword, saying your father secured his fortune by the use of the sword [I.O. *MS*—you imitate your father. In the books it was related that their faith was such]. In the year 300 of the Hijra (912) they (the Rūs) became Christians and ac-

---

[9] On this passage cf. *Ḥudūd al-'Ālam,* 321-324.

[10] Something is missing, probably "between them and the land of the Pechenegs," as in Marvazī, *op. cit.,* 35.

[11] *Marvazī,* 117. On the Ṣaqāliba in general, and their identification, cf. *Ibn Faḍlān, op. cit.,* 295-331.

[12] This name has been explained as *Svetopluk,* cf. *Ḥudūd al-'Ālam,* 430.

[13] The first name has been identified as the title *župan,* the town possibly as Cracow, *ibid.,* 431.

[14] It has been proposed that the Rūs established their center in the Azov Sea region, and the island refers to that area, cf. G. Vernadsky, *Ancient Russia* (New Haven, 1943), 282.

cepted the Christian faith. Then they put their swords in their scabbards.[15] Since they knew no other profession (than the sword), and the door of their profession was (now) locked, they became distressed. Their pleasure was gone. So they became partial to the religion of Islam and became Muslims. Their motive in (accepting) Islam was that raiding and the holy war would be lawful for them. They sent messengers to the Khwārazmshāh, who were four kinsmen (of their king). The king was independent and was called Vladimir *(Būlādmīr),* just as the king of Turkistān is called *Khāqān,*[16] and the king of the Bulghārs *Yiltavar* (or *Elteber).* When the messengers came to the Khwārazmshāh he was pleased that they were well inclined towards Islam. He showed them honors and sent a religious man (of the imāms) to teach them the principles of Islam. Then they all became Muslims. They made raids on distant lands and always travelled by sea in boats. Every boat which they encountered they attacked and pillaged. They were more powerful than other nations, except they had no horses. If they had had horses they would have conquered many peoples."

A *MS* of the original Arabic source from which 'Aufī copied his account was discovered a few years ago in the India Office library, and the words are almost identical. The translation from Arabic to Persian in this case was quite faithful.[17]

The account of 'Aufī in turn was used by many later writers. The history of Shukrullāh Shirvānī, written for the Ottoman sultan Murad II,[18] copies 'Aufī almost verbatim, except for one emendation. In the account of the conversion of the Rūs to Christianity in 300, 'Aufī says *tarsānīdeh—ānd* "they became Christians," which Shukrullāh changes to *tarsā shudand* "they became afraid" and accepted Islam, not mentioning Christianity. The Marvazī—'Aufī-Shukrullāh,

[15] The swords of the Rūs were famous. Cf. *Kitāb al-jamāhir fī ma'rifa 'l jawāhir* of Abū'l Rayḥān al-Bīrūnī (Hyderabad, Deccan, 1355/1936), 250, 254.

[16] This is an old Turkish title found in the Orkhon inscriptions. The Arabic reading has been amended by A. Zeki-Validi Togan, *Ibn Faḍlān's Reisebericht* (Leipzig, 1939), 105-6.

[17] The Arabic work is Marvazī, *op. cit.*

[18] On this book cf. C. Storey, *Persian Literature,* Section II, fasc. 1, (London, 1935), 91. I used the University of Istanbul copy, F-801, not mentioned by Storey.

(and later authors) tradition is the only one where the name of the king of the Rūs, Vladimir, is mentioned, but further searching may add more light to this.

The first of the published works of interest here is the *Ta'rīkh-i-Fakhru'd-dīn Mubārakshāh,* Persian ed. by E. D. Ross (London, 1927). It was written in 1206.[19] On page 42 the author says, "The Rūs (Rūsiyān) live in islands and do not indulge in tillage or cultivation. They are always boasting, and they make captives of the Slavs whom they sell. They carry away household articles and grain on raids, and make a living on these. They place a sword beside every son who is born, so that when he grows up his profession will be this (sword).[20] Part of them burn their dead and others bury them standing in the grave."

On p. 46 he says, "The Khazars also have a script which is related to the script of the Rūs. A group of Rūm, who are near them, write in this script and are called Rūm-Rūs. They write from left to right and the letters are not joined to one another. They number twenty-one."[21]

The second published work is the *Akhbār al-zamān* supposedly written by Abū'l Ḥasan al-Mas'ūdī about 943, and printed in Cairo in 1938.[22] On p. 69 the author says of the Slavs:

"The Ṣaqāliba are composed of several nations. Some are Christians, while others are said to be Magians and worship the sun.

"They have a fresh water sea which extends from a northern district to the south. They also have a sea which extends

---

[19] Cf. E. D. Ross, "The Genealogies of Fakhr-ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh," in *'Ajab Nāme, a Volume of Oriental Studies presented to E. G. Browne* (Cambridge, 1922), 392-4.

[20] This is related in Ibn Rūsta, *Kitāb al-a'lāq al-nafīsa,* BGA VII, ed. M. de Goeje (Leiden, 1892), 145.

[21] The *Kitāb al-fihrist* of Ibn al-Nadīm, ed. G. Flügel, (Leipzig, 1871), 20, says the Rūs wrote on wood. (Trans. in C. M. Frähn, "Ibn el-Nedim's Nachricht von der Schrift der Russen," *Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences,* Series 6, vol. 3 (St. Petersburg, 1836), 513.) The old Church Slavonic alphabet had 38 different characters.

[22] Two manuscripts (both fragmentary) of this work were found, one in Paris; cf. Brockelmann, *op. cit.,* S I, 220. A copy of this was placed in Cairo; cf. *Fihrist al-kutub al-'Arabīya al-maujūda bi dār al-kutub al-Miṣrīya,* 5 (Cairo, 1930), 13-4. Another was found in the Tīmūr library in Cairo; cf. introduction to the edition, p. 13 (s).

from east to west until it joins the final (another?) sea, which comes from the district of al-Bulghār. They have many rivers which are all in the north. There is not a salt sea because their land is far from the sun, hence their water is sweet. (Water) which is near the sun is salty. That (land) which extends beyond them on the north is uninhabited because of the great cold and earthquakes. Most of their tribes are Magians and they burn themselves (their dead) in the fire, and they worship it. They have many cities and towns, and churches with bells suspended in them, which they strike like a gong.

"There is a group of them (other people?) between the Saqāliba (proper) and the Franks who hold the religion of the Sabians.[23] That is to say that they worship the stars. They have fine knowledge and capacity in every art. They war against the Saqāliba, the Burjān, and the Turks. They have seven holidays during the year according to the names of the planets, but the most important of them is the festival of the sun."[24]

Another source on the Rūs is the *Kitāb manāhij al-fikr wa mabāhij al-'ibr* by Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Warrāq al-Waṭwāṭ, who died 1318.[25] He was the source of Shams al-Dīn Dimashqī, who wrote his account of the Rūs shortly after the preceding.[26] Al-Warrāq says:

"They (Rūs) have islands in the sea of Māyuṭis[27] where they live. They fight the Khazars on war boats. They reach them from the bay which opens on to this sea from the river Itil. When they travel along the course of the river, they continue from the final bay which empties into the Caspian Sea; then they launch an attack upon them (the Khazars). They (the Rūs) are Magians in religion[28] and burn their dead in

[23] It is unclear to whom this refers. This is not found in other Islamic geographers.

[24] Some Muslims thought the people of eastern and northern Europe were fire and sun worshippers; Marvazī, *op. cit.*, 117, and note 28 below.

[25] This passage is reproduced in A. Seippel, *Rerum Normannicarum Fontes Arabici* (Christianiae, 1896), 103-4. Cf. Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, S II, 54.

[26] A.F. Mehren, ed. *Cosmographie de Chems ed-Dīn Abou Abdallah Mohammed ed-Dimichqui* (St. Pétersbourg, 1866), 262.

[27] Dimashqī adds: "Then they became Christians."

[28] The *Ḥudūd al-'Ālam*, 158, says this of the Slavs. See also 'Aufī above, and Ibn Rusta, *op. cit.*, 144.

fire. Some shave their beards, some twist them, and others braid them. They have a special language. This people is a neighbor of al-Ālān and al-Burjān."

From these accounts little is added to the material already known about South Russia in the early Middle Ages, but much remains to be done in the study and *interpretation* of the material now available. It is more and more becoming possible for a Slavic scholar to work on the translations and notes available from Islamic sources, and, in combination with other sources, to present a clearer picture of the history of the period.

Note on the Jayhānī Manuscript in Kābul[28a]

The importance of Jayhānī as the source for later Muslim authors, especially for the peoples and countries of Central Asia, has been frequently emphasized.[29] I wish here merely to describe the *MS* preserved in the state museum of Kābul, Afghanistan.

I was only able to make a cursory examination of the manuscript for it was then the subject of continuous study. At a first glance the manuscript does not seem old. The writing is quite legible *naskhī,* and not different from the usual 16-19th century manuscript style of Persian. The *MS* is entitled *Āshkāl al-'ālam* or *Masālik-i-mamālik* of Jayhānī. In the text his name is given as Abū'l Qāsim ibn Aḥmad Jayhānī.[30] There are only forty-three sheets, and eighty-one written pages, with nineteen maps in color which are well done. The pages are 28 cm. long and 18 cm. wide, with 27 lines to the page.

On page one the translator says that the king of the times *(pādishāh-i-'aṣr)* Abū'l Nāṣr 'Alī Khwāja Ibn Muḥammad wālī amīr

---

[28a] My article was written at the beginning of 1947, before the publication of the article by V. Minorsky, "A False Jayhānī," in *BSOAS,* 13 (1949), 89-96. I am happy to see my remarks confirmed by Professor Minorsky whose article now adds to the remarks below.

[29] Cf. Brockelmann, op. cit., I, 228; S I, 407. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion,* 12-3. I have just received from Kābul reprints of three articles describing the manuscript, which have been used to check my own observations, as well as to add additional information. The articles are entitled the "Āshkāl al-'Ālam yā Masālik-i-Mamālik," by Hāshim Shāīq in the journal *Aryānā,* vol. 1, no. 2, 27-32 (with two maps reproduced), vol. 3, 40-44, and vol. 5, 23-7, all of the year 1943.

[30] The name of Jayhānī as preserved in the *Irshād al-arīb of Yāqūt,* ed. D. H. Margoliouth (London, 1909), II, 59, is Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Naṣr Abū 'Abdallāh al-Jayhānī. The same is found in the *Kitāb al-fihrist* of Ibn al-Nadīm, ed. G. Flügel, 138.

al-Mu'minīn,[31] ordered this book, which was in his private library, translated from Arabic to Persian. On page 81 the translator gives his name as 'Abd al-Aṣghar 'Alī ibn 'Abd al-Salām. At the very end, the name of the scribe is recorded as al-Kātib 'Abd al-Ḍa'if Naḥīf Ḥājī Khān ibn Marḥūmī Maghfūrī Ḥājī Muḥammad Ḥusain Qazwīnī, written in the month of Jumādā the second of the year 18. The latter is clearly an abbreviation and the date of writing cannot be determined.

On page one the purpose of the book is declared to be a description of the countries of Islam, the seas (*daryā-hā*) and the canals (or rivers—jūī-hā). *Jūī* is not a word one would expect to find in this sense, in the beginning of a classical text. However on page 76, in speaking of the city of Samarqand, the story of an iron plate with Himyaritic writing on it, affixed to a gate of the city, is related. This story has been passed on by a number of later geographers, the earliest of whom is *Ibn Ḥauqal*. He relates, "Abū Bakr al-Dimashqī said, I saw on a great gate (of the city of Samarqand) an iron plate with writing on it. The people believed it was Himyaritic."[32] The relatively large section (pp. 72 to the end) on Transoxiana would tend to support contention that the author was a native of this area. Jayhānī was an inhabitant of Bukhārā and well-informed on the peoples and countries of Central Asia.

The value of the Kābul Jayhānī *MS*, however, cannot be determined without careful examination and comparison with other Islamic geographers. Now there are two Persian *MSS* preserved in the British Museum which are said to be the geography of Jayhānī,[33] but it has been proposed that both were probably copied from Iṣṭakhrī's work.[34] One of these *MS* (Or. 1587) is dated 1256/1840, copied in the city of Kābul! Thus it may well be a copy of the *MS* preserved in the Kābul museum or vice-versa. If such is the case, although there is not enough evidence to be sure, then the *MS* of Jayhānī preserved in Kābul is not even a partial translation of the lost opus. It is highly improbable that this will ever be found, but so much has been borrowed by other geographers from Jayhānī that in a sense Jayhānī is not lost.

RICHARD N. FRYE
Harvard University

[31] The ruler, under whom Jayhānī was vezir, was Naṣr ibn Aḥmad ibn Isma'īl, generally considered the third ruler of the Sāmānid dynasty.

[32] *Opus Geopraphicum auctore Ibn Haukal*, ed. J. H. Kramers, BGA II, new series, (Leiden, 1939), 494. I have seen a reference referring this story to Jayhānī, but cannot locate the source.

[33] C. Rieu, *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 1 (London, 1879), 415-8, nos. Add. 23, 542 and Or. 1587.

[34] S. Janicsek, "Al-Djaihani's lost Kitab al-Masalik val-Mamalik," *BSOS*, 5 (1928), 19-21.

EARLY DISCUSSIONS ABOUT THE QUR'ĀN

[1]The study of the growth and elaboration of the doctrine of the uncreatedness of the Qur'ān among Muslim theologians up to the time of al-Ash'arī is not of purely antiquarian interest. It has a direct bearing on the problem of time and eternity, which is sometimes said to be the most important philosophical question of this age; and perhaps these ancient thinkers of Islam, forced to ever more subtle modifications of their positions by the logic of facts, have something of value to contribute to the discussion which is taking place in our own day.

It is a feature common to religions based on a historical revelation that the systematic formulation of their beliefs is a gradual process. For decades or even centuries men hold along with one another beliefs which, as popularly formulated, have contradictory implications. They are apparently unaware of these implications and of their contradictory character and make no attempt to reconcile, by a more careful formulation, what superficially is contradictory. In the end, however, men are usually driven to undertake such a reconciliation by the requirements of apologetic against other religions or against fellow-members of their own religion who emphasize different aspects of it.

Islam is no exception to this rule. The arguments about the createdness of the Qur'ān led to the unfolding and making explicit of truths already present in the earliest Islamic faith, but not yet explicit there. It has sometimes been claimed that Christian influence was important in the evolution of Muslim views about the Word of God, but detailed study gives little support to this claim. There was doubtless some familiarity with the outlines of Christian doctrine—al-Ma'mūn himself drew a comparison between Muslims of the opposing party and the Christians on this very point[2]—but any strong influence would presuppose a much deeper understanding of Christian theology than any Muslim possessed. Moreover the hypothesis of Christian influence is hardly necessary in this particular sphere, since the development of the doctrine can be

---

[1] The following abbreviations are used in the notes:
AHM = *Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and the Miḥna* by W. M. Patton, Leiden, 1897.
EI = *Encyclopaedia of Islam.*
Ibāna = *Kitāb al-Ibāna 'an Uṣūl al-Diyāna* by al-Ash'arī (cited by the pages of the Hyderabad edition).
Intiṣār = *Kitāb al-Intiṣār* by al-Khaiyāṭ, ed. Nyberg, Cairo, 1925.
Q. = Qur'ān.
Maq. = *Maqālāt al-Islāmīyīn* by al-Ash'arī, ed. Ritter, 1929-30.

[2] *AHM*, 67, quoting from al-Ṭabarī; cp. also *Ibāna*, 26.

fairly adequately explained from the context of Islamic thought, as the working out of tendencies already manifest there.

From the earliest days of Islam there had been two firm and, for the Muslim, entirely justified convictions:

(1) the Qur'ān is the Word of God;
(2) the Qur'ān appeared in time.

These convictions belonged to the inmost fiber of the religion. Its ultimate basis was the belief that God had spoken to Muhammad, or perhaps rather had spoken through him to the Arabs and other Muslims. The Qur'ān was what had been said, and therefore it must be God's word or speech. But just as clearly the appearance of the Qur'ān was an event in the sequence of history; in the terse Arabic phrase, "it was not, then it was."[3] It was precisely from this event, the coming of God's word to Muhammad, that Islam as a historical movement had sprung. Undoubtedly, then, both these convictions express something fundamental to the Muslim faith; but just because of that they quickly lead to the philosophical and metaphysical problems of the relation of the eternal and the temporal.

1. *The Jahmīya.* It is probably impossible now to determine when the doctrine that the Qur'ān was created was first held *explicitly*. Statements that it was held by theologians of the first and even of the second century must be accepted with great reserve. It would be only too easy for a "creationist" seeking support for his doctrine, or for an unscrupulous writer trying to malign a hero of his opponents, to infer from a quite non-committal statement about the appearance of the Qur'ān in time that the author of this statement held that the Qur'ān was created. There is the further difficulty that, though the connection of the doctrine with the Jahmīya is well established, much obscurity surrounds the Jahmīya, and in particular it is difficult to know which views were held explicitly by Jahm himself (d.128/746), and which only by his followers.

The earliest person who is reported to have held that the Qur'ān was created was al-Ja'd b. Dirham. He belongs to the close of the first century, for he was put to death by the caliph Hishām (105-125); he was the teacher of Jahm, and the last Umaiyad caliph, Marwān b. Muḥammad al-Ja'dī, belonged to his sect—if the reports are to be trusted.[4] The little that we hear about his views is very much what we should expect from a forerunner of the Jahmīya. He was said to have been a Manichaean and to have been the first both to take views from the Sabaeans and philosophers and to hold the doctrine of *ta'ṭīl* (the denial of human or mundane attributes to

[3] *lam yakun thumma kān—Maq.* 582, etc.
[4] S. Pines, *Beiträge zur islamischen Atomenlehre,* Berlin, 1936, p. 124; *AHM,* 47.

God). The assertion that he derived the doctrine of the Qur'ān's creation from a Jew called Labīd may be merely slander.[5]

Great importance is to be attached to the statement of Ibn Taimīya, doubtless based on ancient Ḥanbalī tradition to which he had access, that towards the end of the second century, after the translation of Greek books, the *maqāla* known to the ancients as *maqāla Jahmīya* was spread by Bishr. b. Ghaiyāth al-Marīsī and his generation.[6] This fits in with the report that in the early years of Harūn al-Rashīd (say, about 175 A.H.) he was accused of holding the doctrine of the creation of the Qur'ān and consequently remained hidden till after the death of that caliph (in 193).[7] Certainly the close of the second century was the heyday of the popularity of the Jahmīya as theologians, and this period saw the beginnings of that stream of publications entitled "Refutation of the Jahmīya."[8] I am inclined to think that the views commonly ascribed to the Jahmīya, at least in the form in which they are recorded, belong mainly to this time, and that Bishr al-Marīsī may properly be regarded as the second founder of the sect. There is a report that he was the first to hold that the Qur'ān was created,[9] and, even if this is not strictly true, the very fact that such a report could be given currency shows that prior to the time of Bishr no considerable body of opinion had laid special emphasis on a doctrine of this sort. It may very well be that Bishr was indeed the first to make this doctrine fully explicit and bring it into prominence. The claim that it was merely the restatement of views held by Jahm is paralleled by the claim of the Mu'tazila to derive their theories from Wāṣil (d.131), and even to have Companions of the Prophet in their sect;[10] but a comparison of the meager details known about Wāṣil with the rich records of Abū'l-Hudhail and his contempo-

---

[5] *AHM,* 47. C. H. Becker, *Christliche Polemik u. islamische Dogmenbildung,* in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie,* XXVI, p. 188, reprinted in *Islamstudien,* I, 443, interprets a passage of S. John of Damascus (Migne, *PG,* XCVI, 1341f.) to mean that the createdness of the Qur'ān was a heresy among the Muslims in his day (he died about 133/750). This is probably mistaken, however. The crucial words are: "such persons are counted heretics among the Saracens"; but it would be most natural to apply them to those who say God has no Word or Spirit, and this view is quite distinct from the view that the Qur'ān is created. If Becker's interpretation is correct, I should be inclined to hold that the passage is not by S. John himself, but comes from someone writing a century later at least.

[6] *Al-'Aqīda al-Ḥamāwīya,* quoted in M. Schreiner, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der theologischen Bewegungen in Islam,* p. 121 of the "Separatdruck" (from *ZDMG,* LII, LIII).

[7] cp. *AHM,* 48, based on al-Jawzī, quoted in al-Maqrīzī; also *EI,* art on Bishr al-Marīsī by Carra de Vaux; a recent Egyptian edition of Ibn Khallikān writes his father's name Ghiyāth.

[8] cp. Ibn Taimīya, l.c.

[9] Quoted by Nyberg in a note in *Intiṣār,* 201f.

[10] Ibn al-Murtaḍā, *Munyā.*

raries in al-Ash'arī's *Maqālāt al-Islāmīyīn* makes it abundantly clear that the prominent body of theologians known to history as the Mu'tazila had their origin essentially in the time of Abū'l-Hudhail. It is highly probable that the somewhat similar system of thought attributed to the Jahmīya stands in an analogous relation to his contemporary, Bishr al-Marīsī.[11]

If with this tentative conclusion we leave the question of the membership and historical position of the Jahmīya and turn to what we know of their doctrines, there is much to help us to understand how the doctrine of the createdness of the Qur'ān became an integral part of their system.

The Jahmīya (in common with the Mu'tazila) held the doctrine of *tawḥīd,* the assertion of the unity (of God), which in practice meant an extreme monism.[12] One expression of this is the view that Paradise and Hell will come to an end, together with all those who dwell in them, so that God alone will remain in solitary state to all eternity, just as He was from all eternity before He created the world.[13] It may be that in connection with this they envisaged the absorption of men and other creatures into the being of God, rather than mere extinction. Yet at least one sub-group of them is related to have held that the soul died as well as the body;[14] and their rejection of most of the common Muslim eschatological conceptions is apparently to be coupled with this denial of immortality and not with any attempt to describe the future life in rationalistic terms. In any case they clearly believed that God alone is eternal.

Another expression of the same monistic tendency is the view that God is the sole author of all historical events, the unique source of all activity, the only true wielder of power. Man may indeed be said to act and to do things, but this is a metaphor; activity can no more be ascribed to man in reality than it can to a stone when we say that it flies through the air.[15] Thus the Jahmīya go a long way towards making God everything and reducing man to nothing; they have failed to realize all the implications of the fact that in creating man God has bestowed on him a certain measure of reality. The uniqueness of God and His dissimilarity to men and

---

[11] A further line of connection between Bishr al-Marīsī and the Jahmīya may be noted. Al-Najjār is said to have taken his views from Bishr al-Marīsī—cp. Nyberg in *Intiṣār,* 180 n., based on the biographical dictionary of Ibn Abī 'l-Wafā', s. v. Bishr; there is a close connection between al-Najjār and Dirār b. 'Amr, and of Dirār it is said "his Imām is Jahm" (in a poem by Bishr b. al-Mu'tamir in *Intiṣār,* 134.

[12] cp. the description of Jahm as *muwaḥḥid* in *Intiṣār,* 126.

[13] *Maq.* 542 and *passim.*

[14] The eighth sect in the quotation from Khushaish in *Kitāb al-Tanbīh* by al-Malaṭī; cp. also the seventh sect.

[15] *Maq.* 279, etc.

all created things can be overemphasized until it becomes absurd; God is certainly real and is also existent (in some senses of the word), but it is incorrect to argue that, because man does not resemble Him, man must be unreal and non-existent.

This line of thought, namely that God is unique and that nothing resembles Him, is the essence of what the Muslims call *ta'ṭīl*, literally the stripping from God of everything anthropomorphic. No attribute might belong to God which belonged to man. Where the Qur'ān gave to God names which were also applicable to men, various methods were employed to deal with this situation. It was asserted, for instance, that God alone was really "agent" (*fā'il*) and "potent" or "wielder of power" (*qādir*), and that it was only metaphorically that these terms could be applied to men.[16] Alternatively the Quranic names could be interpreted as conveying only negative knowledge about God; thus to say He is "knowing" merely tells us that He is not ignorant.[17] But one cannot help suspecting that many of the Jahmīya sat somewhat loosely to the text of the Qur'ān, and simply neglected it in their theological statements. The views of one section of them are described by a series of negatives; among the qualities which are not to be attributed to God are "strong," "mighty," "living," "dead," "annoyed," "pleased," "compassionate," "rejoicing," "hearing," "seeing."[18] Another and more sober sub-group, described as a sect of the Mu'aṭṭila (or holders of *ta'ṭīl*), maintained that God is not a thing, nor *of* a thing, nor *in* a thing;[19] the underlying idea is undoubtedly that "thing" is a term commonly applied to creatures and that God is *toto coelo* different from His creatures. Those who held that God is not a thing had a word to describe the process by which they reached such knowledge of God as they had; it was *takhmīm*,[20] in other words, a consideration of what man is not. In this way they come to the conclusion that God is characterized above all by Divinity (*ulūha*). Thus the method of *ta'ṭīl* leads to an abstract, bare and featureless conception of God, which robs the religious consciousness of much that is precious to it.

There is also a strong pantheistic strain in the teaching of the Jahmīya. This follows naturally along with the view that God is active and operative in all events; and it is this belief in the omnipresence of God that leads them to deny the common Muslim doc-

---

[16] *Maq.* 589; al-Baghdādī, *Farq bain al-Firaq*, 208; etc.

[17] *Maq.* 487; etc. This was especially the view of Dirār b. 'Amr.

[18] Khushaish in al-Malaṭī, *Tanbīh*, 76, fifth sect.

[19] *Min, fī; Tanbīh*, 75, first sect. The second sect modified this view, trying apparently to avoid the absurdity while preserving the main point: God is a thing, but not as the things.

[20] *EI*, art. *Tashbīh*, by Strothmann.

trine that God is seated on the throne, which seemed to them to involve spatial restriction.[21] Thus in another direction there is an attempt to make God everything, and to deny the comparatively independent existence He has bestowed on His creatures.

There is a wide-spread report, though in various forms, that the doctrines of the Jahmīya were elaborated in the course of the defense of Islam against the materialistic teaching of the Sumanīya. At the conclusion of his account of the views of the eight sub-groups of the Jahmīya, Khushaish writes:[22] "This is the whole of the Kalām of the Jahmīya. They derive their name from Jahm b. Safwān, who was the first to derive this Kalām from the Kalām of the Sumanīya, a sect of the Persians, in the regions of Khurāsān. They made him doubt about his religion, so that he omitted prayer for forty days. He said: I shall not pray to One Whom I do not know. Then he worked out this Kalām and later men elaborated it." This can be filled out a little from the version of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal.[23] There he is said to have given the answer at the end of forty days to those who asked him how he knew God existed: "How do you know your own spirit (*rūḥ*) exists?"—for the Sumanīya held that all knowledge came through the senses. The interpretation of these records appears to be that the Jahmīya, faced with materialistic denials of the existence of God, had recourse to a theory of spirit; and, in the light of what we have already learnt about them, we may conjecture that they regarded God as omnipresent, immanent Spirit. Such a conception was doubtless connected with mystical doctrines and practices.

It is not difficult to see that for people who held such views as these there could be no hesitation in affirming that the Qur'ān was created. Not only was there the obvious fact that "it was not, then it was," but the Qur'ān was something finite, belonging to time and place, and also constituted out of the same human words that were used in other contexts. It could not possibly belong to the essence of God, the infinite and eternal. This would be a limitation of God's being, and He was far exalted above such limitation. In accordance with this they asserted that when Moses heard a voice, he did not hear the speech of God or God speaking—the infinite God could not be restricted to the compass of finite words—what he heard was merely a speech created by God.[24]

The report that they held that God's knowledge is created is

---

[21] Cp. *Tanbīh*, 76, fourth sect.

[22] *Tanbīh*, 77.

[23] *Radd 'alā 'l-Jahmīya*, 314f., quoted by Pines, *Atomenlehre*, 133. The version in the *Munyā* of Ibn al-Murtaḍā, which makes "rational proof" the solution of the difficulty, is from Mu'tazilī sources and reflects the views of the Mu'tazila.

[24] *Tanbīh*, 75, second sect.

not separate from this; we shall see below that God's knowledge played an important part in the counter-arguments of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal. What they strenuously denied was that anything which even superficially appeared to have a substantive reality of its own could be eternal. The quality of Divinity—and presumably that of eternity along with it—could not be applied to any attribute of God; and what was not eternal must, it seems to have been argued, have been created.

Yet when all this is stated, no grounds have manifested themselves for supposing that the Jahmīya thrust forward their views about the Qur'ān. Rather one would conclude that they stated their view explicitly only after the opposite had been asserted. For it is the uncreatedness of the Qur'ān which is not obvious.

2. *Al-Ma'mūn and the Miḥna.* Our records bear abundant evidence that the Mu'tazila held that the Qur'ān was created, but there is very little sign that they argued about this. Usually it seems to have been accepted as a starting-point, and the arguments then dealt with questions of detail. However, al-Ṭabarī in his *History,* has preserved some letters of the caliph al-Ma'mūn, the friend of the Mu'tazila, written when he was trying to make the acceptance of the createdness of the Qur'ān compulsory for all state officials. These may be regarded as a sample of Mu'tazilī arguments.

It is quite clear that an important part of the intention is to uphold the principle of *tawḥīd* (the assertion of unity), which was common to Mu'tazila and Jahmīya. The opponents, who seem to have called themselves Ahl al-Ḥaqq wa 'l-Dīn" (Men of Truth and Religion), are accused of being "deficient in the belief in God's unity";[25] likewise it is argued that "he has no belief in God's unity who does not confess that the Qur'ān is created."[26] The cognate thought of the dissimilarity of God from all creatures is to be traced in the remark that by thinking "that it has not been created . . . they expose themselves to the risk of denying the creating by God of all things, by which (act) He is distinguished from His creation."[27]

The arguments are all drawn from verses of the Qur'ān, but it is worth noticing the particular points governing the selection of verses, as revealed by the accompanying comment. There are first of all verses which speak of God dealing with the Qur'ān in the same manner as He deals with creatures; the word "make" even occurs. The favorite verse of this sort is 43:2, "We have made it an Arabic Qur'ān." Then there are verses which imply that the Qur'ān

[25] *AHM,* 59, quoting from al-Ṭabarī's *History.*
[26] *AHM,* 69.
[27] *AHM,* 67.

has a place in the temporal series of events. The phrase "We will tell thee tidings of what went before" (20,99) is interpreted as a declaration on God's part that the Qur'ān is an account of things *after* whose happening He *produced* it. And after the quotation of 41:42, "Falsehood shall not come up to it either from before or after it," the remark is appended that "thus He puts (at least by possibility) something before and after it, and so indicates that it is finite and created."[28] The finitude or limitation of the Qur'ān is also said to be implied by the fact that it is on the Preserved Table,[29] and such limitation, it is again argued, is only possible in the case of what is created. Thus these letters of al-Ma'mūn echo the words and spirit of the Jahmīya, and give expression to a truly religious conviction that what is limited in time and place cannot belong to the essential being of God.

While these genuine theological motives can be traced in the letters of al-Ma'mūn, it is highly improbable that his attempt to make the doctrine of the createdness of the Qur'ān compulsory for all his officials was the outcome of zeal for pure theology. Undoubtedly politics were much mixed up with it, though this is an aspect of the *Miḥna* or Inquisition which deserves fuller investigation. Perhaps al-Ma'mūn was trying to win the support of at least the more moderate members of the Shī'a or party of 'Alī; some of the Mu'tazila had political affiliations of this sort. At any rate al-Ma'mūn is said to have "declared his belief that, after the Prophet, 'Alī was the chiefest of mankind; on which dogma is also built up the Divine Imamate, or spiritual leadership vested from time to time in some member of the house of 'Alī."[30] Likewise the return to Sunnī orthodoxy some twenty years later was accompanied by a reversal of policy on the question of 'Alī, expressed in a reaction from veneration to contempt, and this doubtless meant that all attempts to conciliate the moderate Shī'a had been given up.[31]

Now it is easy to see that the attitude to the Qur'ān may be closely connected with the attitude to the descendants of the Prophet. As Muir expresses it, "it began to be taught that, apart from the Qur'ān and tradition, there might be other infallible sources of Divine guidance."[32] The doctrine of the uncreated Qur'ān by itself made the importance of Muḥammad consist primarily in his being the recipient of the Divine message; the message was everything and the man almost nothing (but it should be noted that later orthodoxy corrected the one-sidedness of this by various

[28] *AHM*, 58, 68.
[29] Q.85:21f.; *AHM*, 67; *lawḥ maḥfūẓ*.
[30] Muir, *The Caliphate, its Rise, Decline and Fall*, 1892, p. 503.
[31] *ib.* 521.
[32] *ib.* 503.

complementary truths). The party of 'Alī had rather emphasized the personality of Muḥammad and supposed him to have a Divinely inspired wisdom by which he carried on his work as a political and religious leader (a wisdom which was indeed acknowledged by all Muslims by the respect they paid to Tradition); and it was further believed that this Divine inspiration had been inherited by his physical descendants. The extreme Shī'a would certainly have put the man far above the message. Whether the caliphs merely wanted to appease the supporters of the 'Alids, or whether they had also some idea of enhancing their own position (as descendants of the Prophet), they would naturally link a depreciation of the Qur'ān with an exaltation of the importance of personal gifts.[33]

There is one serious difficulty, however, about this sort of view. The arguments in the letters of al-Ma'mūn, as given by al-Ṭabarī, show no trace of the emphasis on personality which one would expect where there was any sympathy with the views of the Shī'a. The dominant thought is that of the abstract unity of God; but it is just as difficult to reconcile the conception of a God-inspired person with this abstract unity as it is that of a Divine message. Several explanations are possible, including the supposition that the letters are false. The most probable view, however, seems to be that al-Ma'mūn had no real theological sympathy with the supporters of the house of 'Alī, that the move for reconciliation was a purely political one, and that—concealing his true intentions—he used the arguments of the Mu'tazila which were handy. The rejection of the doctrine of the createdness of the Qur'ān as part of the official creed is said to have come about when some theologians insisted that to make the doctrine compulsory was an innovation;[34] this again was very likely only an excuse for giving up the policy of reconciliation with the 'Alid supporters which had so clearly failed.

These remarks must clearly be taken as no more than suggestions towards the elucidation of matters which require much more investigation on the historical side. What is relatively certain is that, so far as our records go, the motive of al-Ma'mūn or his advisers on the theological side was the monistic one of *tawḥīd*.

3. *Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and the doctrine of Uncreatedness.* Al-Ash'arī gives a list of the older doctors who held that the Qur'ān had not been created.[35] It appears from this that the doctrine had not been explicitly held before about the time of Mālik b. Anas (d. 179). This supports the view suggested above that the question of the Qur'ān was not prominent until the time of Bishr al-Marīsī,

[33] cp. the view expressed by some of the Rawāfiḍ, that the Imams can abrogate the Qur'ān—*Maq.* 611.

[34] *AHM,* 120f.

[35] *Ibāna,* 38f.

and it may well be that it was his *Maqāla Jahmīya* which first raised the storm. On the other hand, there seems to be no good reason why the createdness of the Qur'ān should have been explicitly and provocatively stated until after the opposing party had made some pronouncement about its eternity. One might put forward the hypothesis, as a sheer conjecture, that at some point in reply to an assertion of the Jahmīya about God being unique or alone the "orthodox" party said: What about the Word of God? In any case it is likely that doctrines of this kind would only gradually become explicit on both sides, and unfortunately we have no details to illustrate the process.[36] It is quite possible that the one or two doctors in al-Ash'arī's list earlier than Mālik b. Anas (such as Sufyān al-Thawrī, d. 161), and perhaps Mālik himself, did not hold the doctrine quite explicitly. But the list does seem to indicate reliably that the doctrine received its formulation in the loosely-knit group of lawyers and traditionists round men like Mālik and, later, al-Shāfi'ī.[37]

The first detailed account of the arguments for the eternity of the Qur'ān is found in the biographical and historical notices about Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, who died in 241; the discussions in which he was involved purport to belong to the years 219-235. Some of them consist of replies to particular verbal points. These are not particularly convincing though they were perhaps adequate as *argumenta ad hominem.* Thus in the verse "We have made it an Arabic Qur'ān" (43:2) he argues that the word for "made" here, namely *ja'ala,* does not necessarily involve the sense of *khalaqa* or "created."[38]

The kernel of the argument, however, is the association of the Qur'ān with God's knowledge. "The force of the argument," says Patton, "lies in the fact that the Qur'ān is declared to be knowledge from God, and Aḥmad and such as he regarded this as equivalent to its being inseparable from the Knowledge of God. 'If this knowledge,' say they, 'be uncreated, then the Qur'ān must be uncreated.' Another point which 'Abd al-Raḥmān (an opponent) urged was that God existed when a Qur'ān did not exist; to this Aḥmad replied with the same argument, 'Did God exist and not His knowledge?' "[39] When the Mu'tazila or Jahmīya maintained

[36] In *Maq.* 586 Wakī' (d. 196) is reported to have held that the Qur'ān is part of God *(ba'ḍu-hu),* etc.

[37] The absence of all followers of Abū Ḥanīfa may be due to anti-Ḥanafī prejudice in al-Ash'arī or his sources; al-Baghdādī, *Farq,* 192f., says that Abū Yūsuf (d. about 181) broke off relations with his pupil Bishr al-Marīsī when the latter declared the Qur'ān created; this, however, may be part of al-Baghdādī's attempt to whitewash Abū Ḥanīfa and his more respectable followers; but cp. the tradition in *Ibāna,* 35 (foot).

[38] *AHM,* 90.

[39] *AHM,* 101f.; cp. also p. 90.

that by speaking thus about God's Knowledge Aḥmad was setting up a being similar to God, his reply was simply to repeat that God was one.[40] One is reminded of the formula of *bi-lā kaif* (literally "without How"). This was Aḥmad's way of expressing the fact that in questions of religion it is often necessary to hold firmly to a proposition, even when one is unable to understand it fully and unable to reconcile it with other propositions which must likewise be firmly held; he had realized that the content of religion is always richer than any intellectual description of that content.

Our knowledge of the politics of this period is so scanty that it is difficult to say whether Aḥmad had any political reason for opposing the Caliphs. From laudatory remarks about Muḥammad and his house in Aḥmad's testament,[41] it would seem that he had 'Alid leanings, but the evidence is not sufficient to show to which particular party he belonged. The probability is that, when he found the Caliphs using heretical doctrines (as he thought) for political purposes, he opposed them on purely religious grounds. We can indeed with an approach to certitude discern the religious motive underlying what he did. If God merely created the Qur'ān or any other Word of God (such as that addressed to Moses from the bush), then God Himself was not actually addressing Muḥammad or Moses. That means that the worshipper could not be certain that he had received any communication which really came from God and was expressive of His essential being. What God created might, according to some Muslims, exhibit exactly opposite qualities from those which must be assigned to God; a man, for instance might naturally be weak or ignorant, that is, as a result of God's creation of him. (It is worth noticing that those Muslims who said the Qur'ān was created mostly also said that God created no evil, i.e. that creation exhibited God's attribute of justice; those who denied the createdness of the Qur'ān mostly affirmed that God was the creator of everything, both good and evil, and that implies that creation does not express His essential being.)

That it was this fundamental issue which was at stake is further illustrated by the account which we have of the arguments of Muḥammad b. Aslam, a friend and contemporary of Aḥmad, against the Jahmīya.[42] He first maintains—and supports his contention with Quranic quotations—that God has a Word (*kalām*) and that by this Word He addresses prophets such as Moses; to deny this is to reject God's book. In the second place, there are several verses in the Qur'ān where a speech is addressed to Moses such as "I am God, the Lord of the worlds"; now, if this is said to be cre-

[40] *AHM*, 106.
[41] *AHM*, 147; Arabic text on p. 138.
[42] *AHM*, 36-41.

ated, it is a creature which is saying to Moses "I am God . . . ," and this is rank polytheism. The point round which the argument turns, though it is never made fully explicit, is that speech is a genuine expression of the mind of the speaker, whereas creation according to Aḥmad and his friends, although it proceeds in a sense from the mind of the Creator, is not in the same way an expression of His essential being.

The opposition between the Jahmīya and those who were later accounted as orthodox is connected at a deep level with their very different conceptions of God. The Jahmīya, deriving their ideas from abstract reason and perhaps also from a personality-destroying type of mysticism, tended to ever greater abstraction, until our knowledge of God was practically reduced to the statements that He is one, unique and eternal. The "orthodox" doctors, on the other hand, firmly believing that in some manner and to some degree man does have knowledge of God through historical self-revelation of God—even if that knowledge is also to some extent beyond man's powers of comprehension—tend to a richer and more concrete conception of the Divine essence. God, as abstractly conceived, is remote from men (even though He is omnipresent)—too remote to speak even to a prophet. But God as conceived in the historical and institutional tradition of Islamic worship, is closer to them in every way, reveals to them something of His mind by His communications, and is sufficiently known to them to be trusted to the uttermost.

4. *Mediating Views.* Brief accounts have been preserved of views which come somewhere between those of the Jahmīya and Mu'tazila on the one hand, and those of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal on the other. These views are interesting in that they give us a glimpse of Muslim thought wrestling with various problems in the relations of God the eternal to temporal and historical events, and in particular to the fact that the Qur'ān "was not, then it was."

There are, for instance, Zahīr al-Āthirī and Abū Mu'ādh al-Tūmanī, who possibly flourished about the year 200. In general their position was similar to that of Aḥmad, but they were ready to make some concessions. Zahīr would not admit that the Qur'ān was "created," but in view of the fact that it had appeared in time he applied to it the word "originated" (*muḥdath*).[43] Abū Mu'ādh did not go quite so far; the Qur'ān was not "originated" but an "origination" (or perhaps rather "event"—*ḥadath*), not what is done in an act (*maf'ūl*) but the act itself (*fi'l*); it was truly the Word of God, and was subsisting in God (*qā'im bi-'llāh*), not in anything other than God.[44] These views cannot be adequately crit-

[43] *Maq.* 583; cp. 299.
[44] *Maq.* 583; cp. 300.

icized without fuller knowledge than we possess of the general position of the theologians in question; but it is fairly clear that, while they are nobly trying to hold on to both the belief that the Qur'ān is the Word of God and the fact that it has appeared at a definite point in time, they had not quite grasped the fundamental point Aḥmad was insisting on—that the Qur'ān expresses something of the essential character of God. Abū Mu'ādh comes very close to it when he likens the relation of the Qur'ān to God to the relation of act to agent; but this very comparison leads to a maze of fresh problems rising out of the distinction which may be drawn between the active and the essential attributes of God.

This idea that the Word of God was originated but not created was apparently still alive at the middle of the third century, since al-Ash'arī mentions two examples of its use then.[45] Muḥammad b. Shajjā' al-Thaljī (d.266) held that the Word of God was "originated" but he avoided saying whether it was created or not. This attitude of suspending judgment—the Arabic name for those who did so was "Wāqifa"—may indicate that he thought neither of these qualities could be predicated of God's Word. Again, Dā'ūd b. 'Alī al-Iṣbahānī, founder of the legal school or "rite" of the Ẓāhirīya (d.270), besides holding that the Word of God, *kalām Allāh,* is originated but not created, seems to have thought of *kalām* as an act, and tried to overcome the difficulty of relating a finite, temporal act to an eternal function by asserting that what is eternal is the faculty or potentiality for speaking—"God is eternally a speaker (*mutakallim*) in the sense that He is capable of speech (*qādir 'ala 'l-kalām*). These are straws which show a wind blowing towards deep waters.

At an earlier period Hishām b. al-Ḥakam (who probably died early in the third century) had expressed some of the same views. He had held that God's Word or Speech, on the one hand, is His act, in the same way as His knowledge is His act, and that as such it is His attribute, not identical with Him nor different from Him, and not such as to have other qualities, like createdness or uncreatedness, predicable of it. There are similarities here to several of the other "mediating views." On the other hand, from this act of God he distinguished God's Word as "what is heard," *masmū'* (*sc.* when the Qur'ān is recited), and this is a copy of the Qur'ān; the word for "copy" is *rasm* which originally meant the impression made by a stamp.[46] The first aspect of Hishām's theory cannot be adequately considered apart from the general doctrine of the Divine attributes, and that is beyond the scope of the present article. The

[45] *Maq.* 583.
[46] *Maq.* 582f.

second aspect, the conception of what is heard as a copy, is linked up with questions to be discussed in the next section.

Another type of difficulty led some of those whose heart was in the doctrine of the eternity of the Qur'ān to waver from the true faith in some of their statements. This difficulty was the temporal reference of much of the Qur'ān. How could an assertion about an historical event be eternal when it referred to something that was temporal? Some such thought doubtless underlies the view of "Ibn al-Mājashūn" that the Qur'ān is half created and half not created. Despite this view he was evidently reckoned an upholder of the eternity of the Qur'ān, and he certainly opposed the Jahmīya and maintained that the attributes of God were only positively known through revelation.[47]

Two other reports in the same place help to amplify this view.[48] An unnamed theologian who, though "denying the creation of the Qur'ān, accepted the formula "part created, part not created," enumerated "acts of created beings, names, and statements about their acts" as belonging to the created part. One would have thought that this difficulty was not very serious, since even in a finite knower the knowledge of temporal events transcends the temporal limitations of the events; and the difficulty would be solved when the Qur'ān was identified with God's knowledge. The mere raising of the point, however, shows how heavily the problem of temporal and eternal weighed on these men. Again, one of the Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth or Traditionists (who may or may not have been Sulaimān b. Jarīr) held that whatever in the Qur'ān belongs to God's knowledge cannot be said to be created or to be other than God, but that the commands or prohibitions addressed to men are created. It is only inch by inch that the doctrine of the eternity of the Qur'ān is gaining ground; here it is admitted that propositions about temporal events can be eternally known by God, but orders cannot properly be given to men until the men exist; and so God's commands are regarded as belonging not to His essence but to His activity in time. This problem, however, of the relation of the essential attributes of God to the practical or active attributes is one which I do not propose to discuss in this article.

(to be continued)

W. Montgomery Watt

Edinburgh University

[47] *Maq.* 586. The person intended is probably 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, who died in 212 or 213; but there is some confusion between the members of this family, and the same person is perhaps referred to as 'Abd al-Azīz al-Mājashūn or 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Salma—the latter in the list in *Ibāna,* 38f.; see the Index to *Maq.,* and cp. Schreiner's *Beiträge,* 66.

[48] *Maq.* 585f.

THE QUR'ĀN AS SCRIPTURE

In the old-fashioned classification of religions familiar to our forebears Islam fell among the Scriptural religions as contrasted with those religions which possessed no Holy Book revered by the people as the depository of their religious traditions, and the source to which they turned both for the prescriptions to regulate the daily practice of their religion and the material on which to feed their devotional life. The Qur'ān as the Holy Book of Islam thus belonged to the category of Scripture and took its place among the Sacred Books of the East.

This characterization is still valid. The Qur'ān is the Scripture of Islam. It is the Holy Book which Muslims revere in precisely the same way as other communities have revered and do revere their Holy Books. It is the source from which the Muslim community draws the primary prescriptions for the regulation of daily living, and to which its people turn to find nourishment for their devotional life. That they turn also to Tradition (*ḥadīth*) as a supplementary source both for the regulation of life and for devotion no more lessens the unique authority of the Qur'ān as a Scripture than does the fact that both Jews and Christians also use supplementary sources for the same purpose lessen the Scriptural authority for them of the Old and New Testaments.

Like other Scriptures the Qur'ān passed through various stages of textual history till there emerged a standard text which came to be regarded as sacrosanct. As a sacrosanct text it came in time to function in certain circles as an instrument of magic, in precisely the same way as other sacrosanct texts have done. Like other Scriptures it ere long needed explanation so that it became the subject of Commentaries, at first simple and then elaborate, and the work of the exegetes in Islam has followed very much the same lines of development as we find in the history of the exegesis of other Holy Books. There have been exegetes interested in linguistic and philological problems, others interested in theological and juristic problems, others in a mystical exegesis, and others in using the text for homiletic and devotional purposes. All these are quite legitimate types of exegesis and have been, within their limits, quite as fruitful in the case of the Qur'ān as they have been in the service of other Scriptures. Like other Scriptures the Qur'ān was used liturgically in services of worship, so that, as has happened with other Holy Books, there grew up traditional systems of cantillation of its text for liturgical purposes.

Every Sacred Book, just because it is sacred, is certain to make a deep impression on the cultural life of the community which re-

veres it, yet in some ways the Qur'ān has entered even more deeply into the life of the Muslim community than any other Scripture has done in the older religious groups. To Christians Jesus Himself was the Word of God, so that in the life of the Church He, rather than the written documents, was the Gospel, the "good news," making Scripture of less importance to the Church than the risen Lord ever present and active among them through the Spirit. So we find in the Coptic Manichaean texts that Mani himself is "the Illuminator," the "Master of the Writings," whose person was for the Manichaean community, as that of the Buddha for the various Buddhist communities, far more important than any Scripture. But in Islam Muḥammad is only the mouthpiece of revelation. The Qur'ān is the word of Allah. Later Muslim piety, it is true, has made much of the person of the founder, but it was the Book, the Qur'ān, not the person Muḥammad, which was the significant factor in forming the mould in which the Islamic system took shape.

Arabic philology grew out of the study of the Qur'ān, so that Arabic grammar, to an even greater extent than Hebrew grammar, has been accomodated to the language of the Scripture. Muslim law, which is often regarded as the greatest achievement of the early Muslim community, was given its framework by the *aḥkām*, the commands, prohibitions and judgments found in the Qur'ān. Islamic theology would naturally turn to the Qur'ān for the basic material on which to develop its doctrine of God, doctrine of Man, doctrine of the Last Things, etc., just as the theologies of other religions have turned to their Scriptures for this purpose. Yet if Islamic theology is, as is so often charged, unique in its barrenness, that barrenness is almost wholly due to the fact that the early rise of a dogma as to the impeccability of the Qur'ān as the word of God effectually barred any freedom of theological development. In areas where there was no conflict with the statements of the Qur'ān Muslim theologians often show a remarkable subtlety of mind and capacity for closely reasoned argument, so that had they had freedom the product of their labours might have been very different from what we have from their pens. No one who reads Dr. Elder's recent translation of the Commentary of at-Taftāzānī on the credal statement of al-Nasafī can fail to be struck by the frequency with which the Mu'tazilites opened up promising avenues of theological speculation only to have them closed off by appeal to the consensus of the community that the statements of the Qur'ān must be accepted in simple faith, while any questioning as to *how* or *why* was unbelief.

Even in the realm of literary criticism the Qur'ān was a limiting factor. It may be doubted whether there could have appeared in any

other religious community such a work as al-Bāqillānī's *I'jāz al-Qur'ān,* in which masterpieces of the Arabic literature whose use of words, elegance of diction, variety of expression, stylistic artifice, literary artistry, are to the Western student vastly superior to the uncouthness and dreary monotony of the Qur'ān, are compared in detail with the Qur'ān to their detriment, since *ex hypothesi* the Qur'ān as the word of God must be perfect in style and diction and all that deviates therefrom must be shown to be imperfect.

Thus one can hardly exaggerate the importance of the role that the Qur'ān as the Scripture of Islam has played in moulding the Islamic system as it has developed from century to century. The Scripture of no other community, not even the Old Testament among the Jews, has had quite the same influence on the life of the community as the Qur'ān has had in Islam. One naturally asks why?, and the answer is to be found in the Islamic doctrine of Scripture.

This brings us face to face with an important question, that of the nature of Scripture. In most cases a body of writing that has come to be the Scripture of a community has been given the sacred character which makes it a Holy Book, distinct from other writings which are not holy, by the action of the community. It was the Christian community which selected four Gospels out of many, gathered a corpus of twenty-one Epistles, and combined these with the Acts and the Apocalypse to form the New Testament. It was the Zoroastrian community which drew together the Yasna and the Yashts, the Vendidad and the Visparad to form the older Avesta. These separate writings were not originally written with the idea that they were to enter into the composition of a Holy Book to be called the New Testament or the Avesta, any more than the writings gathered into the Taoist Canon or the various Buddhist Canons were written for the purpose of being included in those Canons of Scripture. The separate writings were the work of individuals, but the forming of them into a Scripture was the work of the community. The writers of the Vedas and the Puranas were no more conscious than the Prophet Amos or the Apostle Paul that they were writing material that would one day form part of a Holy Book and would serve as the Scripture of a religious community. It was the community which decided this matter of what was and what was not Scripture. It was the community which selected and gathered together for its own use those writings in which it felt that it heard the authentic voice of religious authority valid for its peculiar religious experience.

Sometimes the collection of material for such a Scripture and its authorization for use as such were conscious and deliberate. The fixing of the Jewish Canon of Scripture at the Council of Jamnia

c.90 A.D., where certain writings were accepted as authoritative and others excluded as unauthoritative, was a conscious and deliberate action of the community working through its leaders. The reconstruction of the Taoist Canon in the XIth century was likewise a community undertaking, and such "Scripture lists" as that, for example, in the famous 60th Canon of the Council of Laodicea (c.363 A.D.) are but registering the judgment of the community as to what was and what was not to be considered Scripture. In other cases the process was unconscious. No one can say just when and where the Homeric poems came to be in such a curious way the "Bible of the Greeks." In ancient Mesopotamia and in ancient Egypt there were religious texts which continued to be copied by generation after generation of scribes, which seem to have been used liturgically in the temples as in some sense authoritative religious writings, and which certainly were used to feed the devotional life of their communities, yet apparently had come to be accepted in the community without any official authorization.

In all these ancient Scriptures the writings included were of varied authorship, generally anonymous, and coming from different periods in the life of the community whose Holy Book they formed. The nature of the writings accepted into the collection depended to some extent on the culture of the community concerned. Thus a Zoroastrian Parsee feels some astonishment at what the Taoists have included in their Canon, and to us it sometimes seems strange to find, even in deliberately canonized Scriptures, writings of a type that we should never dream of accepting as of religious authority. In each case it was the community feeling, in terms of its own culture, which decided what was to be included and what excluded.

The case of the Qur'ān is obviously very different from this. It is from beginning to end the product of one man and from one period. It was the community which did the formal gathering together of the material after the founder's death and prepared it for use by the community, but its content had been given to them as Scripture before his death. It was not the product of the community in the sense that they decided that this was the collection of writings which had grown up in the community and in which they heard the authentic voice of religious authority, but it was formed by one man and given to the community on *his* authority as a collection of "revelations" which was to be regulative for their religious life as a community. Thus it resembles the Scripture which Mani set himself to provide as the sacred writings for his community, or such modern pseudo-Scriptures as the *Book of Mormon,* or *Oahspe,* or the writings of Baha'ullah, each of which was the work of one man, and consciously produced for the purpose of being used by a

community as a Holy Book. It also has in common with these the fact that it is conscious of the existence of earlier Scriptures, which were authoritative for religious communities, and was produced in deliberate imitation of them.

This fact is of the first importance when we are seeking to understand the Muslim doctrine of Scripture. The writers of the New Testament were aware of and quote from the Old Testament as Scripture. Similarly the compilers of the Khorda Avesta were aware of the older Avesta. In neither case, however, were the authors of the various writings consciously intending to produce documents which would take their place beside the older Scriptures as themselves of Scriptural rank. They were raised to Scriptural rank because the community heard in them the same authentic voice of religious authority it had been accustomed to hear in the older Scriptures. The Qur'ān, on the contrary, was given to the community on the authority of Muḥammad, and the community was bidden to accept it as authoritative in the same way as the Jews and Christians accepted their Scriptures.

What then did Muḥammad conceive the nature of Scripture to be? Unfortunately we can never fully know what Muḥammad himself thought of when he used such words as *Kitāb, waḥy, Qur'ān, āya, ḥikma, 'ilm,* etc., for we have only part of the evidence before us, and no assurance that at this distance we always understand aright all the evidence we have. We have, however, all that the early Muslim community had, and we have fair assurance that what that early community was able to preserve of the pronouncements of its founder has been on the whole faithfully transmitted to us, even though in a fragmentary and curiously jumbled condition. Neither the *Sīra* nor *Tradition* is of much help to us in this matter, and though the exegetes have preserved in their work good evidence of what was thought in their day to be the meaning of words and phrases in the Qur'ān, the bewildering array of variant opinions they record on almost every crucial point of interpretation, makes it quite clear than even the very early circle of exegetes was as much in doubt as we are as to the exact meaning of many of the terms that interest us the most. Modern scholars, however, have the advantage of a knowledge of the environment of sixth century Arabia, particularly its cultural and religious environment, and the use of tools of comparative linguistics and comparative religion, which were not available to earlier generations. So even though we may never be able to answer fully this question of what Muḥammad's conception of Scripture was, we can perhaps approach very close to an understanding of those elements in his thought which were basic to the doctrine of Scripture in Islam.

Our starting point must be the recognition that the Qur'ān is

the result of, and in part the record of, a religious experience of Muḥammad. It was because of a religious experience that he came forward in his generation as a religious reformer, and because of a growing religious experience that he carried through what he felt to be his mission in life. His place in history is that of a founder of a religious community. It may be that the evidence points to his having been a pathological case not to be judged by normal standards of behavior. It may be true that incidentally his mission caused him to be in some sense the champion of the proletariat against a wealthy merchant aristocracy who formed the ruling class. It may be true that he showed himself a man of unusual political genius who deserves to rank among the world's great nationalist leaders. Yet primarily he was a religious leader, as truly convinced as were Luther or John Wesley that he had a "call" to a religious mission, in the first instance to his own people, and then beyond them; a mission on which he would stake everything, and whose successful completion would make an enormous change in the religious life of his world. His "call," his sense of mission, came to him from a religious experience through which he had passed, just as it came in the well known cases of Luther and Wesley just mentioned.

Unfortunately we do not know in Muḥammad's case just what that initial experience was. The familiar account preserved in the *Sīra,* and in *Tradition,* of how the angel appeared to him while he was in meditation practising *taḥannuth* in the cave at Mt. Ḥirā, is obviously based on the vague references to the "call" in the Qur'ān itself, which it seeks to supplement. Moreover, in the details of the account there are so many striking coincidences with the tales preserved of how the great angel Vohu Manah appeared to Zoroaster, after he had spent some time in a natural cave in a mountain, and gave him his "call" to his mission,[1] of how Mani, who had had no human teacher or Master, was called to his mission by an angelic visitant who brought him Divine wisdom,[2] and of how Elchasai[3] was called to his preaching of the One God and an imminent Day of Judgment by an enormous angelic visitant who filled the horizon and brought him sheets of a heavenly book, that one is led to wonder whether the writers of the account in the *Sīra* were not following a pattern of what was popularly recognized in their *Milieu* as the correct way for a religious "messenger" to be called to his mission.

In any case, whatever this initial religious experience may have been, one fruit of it was the Qur'ān, and in the Qur'ān we can

[1] Porphyrius, *de Antro Nymph.* VI.7; *Zāt-sparam,* XXI.8; *Dīnkart,* VII.iii, 51-53.

[2] *Manichäische Homilien,* ed. Polotsky, p. 47; *Fihrist,* ed. Flügel, p. 328; al-Bīrūnī, *Chronologie,* p. 208.

[3] Hippolytus, *Philosopheumena,* IX.13; Epiphanius, *Panarion,* XIX.1; XXX.17.

trace to some extent the development of Muḥammad's conception of his mission, and the measures he took to bring about the religious reformation with which that mission was primarily concerned. The task imposed on him by his acceptance of that mission was a many-sided one, as indeed is the task of every religious reformer. All the varied activities of his ministry, however, arose from his conviction that he was called to bring to the Arabs, who had had no prophet sent them, the same religion which the prophets had brought to those other religious communities whom he referred to as the People of the Book (*Ahl al-Kitāb*). Since they had a Scripture his people must have in Arabic a Scripture. But what did he have in mind when he spoke of Qur'ān and Scripture?

The common word for Scripture is *Kitāb*. This literally means "a writing," then "a written document." The special meaning "book" seems to have developed in Arabic under the influence of Aramaic, but was in use in Arabic in this sense long before the time of Muḥammad. *Kitāb* is used in the secular sense of "letter" in the story of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba in Sūra XXVII.28,29, and of a document of manumission in XXIV.33. The verb is used in II.282,283 with reference to writing contracts, but with these exceptions the word is used in the Qur'ān only in connection with Allah's concerns with His creatures.[4]

The idea that written documents entered into the relations between the divine and the human is to be found very early in the religious history of the Near East. One inheritance from the early Sumerian culture was the feeling that matters of importance must be written, and that there is a certain finality about things when once it can be said, "it is written." So in heaven things were written, as things are on earth, and among the things so written in heaven was the will of the gods concerning the world of men. Perhaps the most solemn day in the annual Mesopotamian celebration of the New Year Festival was the day when all the gods gathered in the "Assembly Room" and went into council to fix the fates and arrange for all that was to happen among men during the coming year, while Nabū, the divine scribe, wrote down the decrees as they were fixed.[5]

Since these written decrees affected men in a particular way we often read of men being shown them. Sirach speaks of God showing men His decrees (*Ecclus.* XVII.12). In *Jubilees* XXXII.21 we read of Jacob being shown seven of the tablets in which were contained

[4] Possibly a secular sense is intended in XXI.104, which describes how on the Last Day Allah will roll up the heavens like a scroll for writings, *(sijill li'l-kutub)*. Otherwise the word used for secular books is *sifr,* (plu. *asfār* in LXII.5), which is cognate with the Heb. *sepher,* Aram. *siphra.* cf. *safara* used for "scribes" in LXXX.15.

[5] See now M. David, *Les dieux et le destin en Babylonie,* Paris, 1949.

records of all the things that were to happen to him and his descendants throughout the ages. The angel said to Enoch: "Observe, Enoch, these heavenly tablets, and read what is written thereon, and mark each fact. And I observed the heavenly tablets, and read everything thereon written, and understood it all. And I read the book of all the actions of man." (*Eth. Enoch* LXXXI.1,2; cf. XCIII.1-3; CIII,2,3; CVI.19; CVII.1: CVIII.7,10). In the *Prayer of Joseph* preserved in *Philocalia* XXIII.15, the patriarch says: "For I have read in the tablets of heaven all that shall befall you and your sons." The angelic figure says to Daniel: "I will tell thee what is inscribed in the writing of truth" (Dan.X,21).

Allah's book of decrees is mentioned several times in the Qur'ān. In it is written whether a man's life is to be long or short (XXXV.-11/12), so that one written down to die cannot escape (III.154/148), nor can anyone die without a written and dated permission from Allah (III.145/139). The punishments to be visited on earthly cities are written there (XV.4; XVII,58/60), and those to be meted out to individuals (XV.79; cf.Jer.XXII,30). No misfortune can happen which was not previously written there (LVII.22; IX.51), because for every term there is a *Kitāb* (i.e.,decree,XIII,38). This is the Book which uttereth truth so that no one will be wronged (XXIII.62/64; XLV.29/28), which contains men's names till the Day of Resurrection (XXX.56), and is apparently the Book in which Allah has written these things that He will surely accomplish (LVIII.21).

Since things are thus recorded as decreed, the word *kitāb* can be used to mean not the Book of Decrees but Allah's decree itself, i.e., what has been *written* for men and must therefore needs come to pass.[6] "Had it not been for a decree (*kitāb*) from Allah which preceded" (VIII.68/69), such and such would have happened. So the prescriptions which Allah has laid down to be observed by men are *kitāb,* something which as decreed may not be set aside (II.236; IV.103/104). *Kutiba,* "it has been written," is used in connection with the law regarding retaliation (II.178/173), testamentary declaration (II.180/176), fasting (II.183/179), holy war (II.216/212). Not only are Allah's laws for the Muslim community thus prescribed (II.187/183; IV.77/79,127/126), but so were His laws for the Jewish community (II.246/247; V.32/35,45/49; VII.156/155), and those for the Christians (LVII.27), while VI.12 and 54 speaks of what Allah has prescribed as incumbent on Himself, by which, as *written,* He himself is bound. A specimen of these things decreed is given in XXII.4, where, concerning Satan, whom ignorant men perversely

[6] Cf. Ps. CXLIX.9; XL.7; *Eth. Enoch* XCI.14; *Slav. Enoch* LIII.3, and note the assumption underlying such New Testament passages as Luke XXII.37; John XV.25.

follow, we read: "Concerning whom it is *written:* 'Whoso takes him as patron will he assuredly lead astray.' "

Another "Book" with Allah, possibly part of this same Book of Decrees, but more likely an independent Book, is the Inventory Book in which everything great and small in His universe is recorded (X.61/62; XI.6/8; VI.59; XXII.70/69; XXVII.75/77; XXXIV.3). It was doubtless in this book of Inventory that Allah had with Him the account of former generations (XX.52/54; cf. *Eth. Enoch* LXXXI.2), for He has neglected nothing in it (VI.38). It would also doubtless be in this Book that such matters as the number of the months was fixed at creation (IX.36), and may be it is the record book referred to in L.4. Seven times this Inventory is called the "clear book," or the "book that makes clear" (*kitāb mubīn*). This immediately refers us back to ancient Mesopotamia where there were elaborate inventories of every kind in order that everything might be kept clear. God's book of inventory is referred to by the Psalmist when he mentions the book in which all his members were written (Ps.CXXXIX.16). The heavenly books into which Enoch looked had an inventory of all things that had been and were yet to be, and the heavenly tablets of the *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* seem to be of this nature, though at times it is difficult to distinguish between the inventory and the Book of Decrees.

Another heavenly Book often mentioned in the literature of the ancient religions is the Record Book or register of the good and evil deeds of men. The Zoroastrian *Yasna* XXXI.14 states that all men's works are duly recorded, and in XLIX.10 and XXXIV.2 we read that this record is preserved in the House of Ahura Mazda. Religious texts from Babylonia speak of the Tablets on which sins are recorded and which suppliants pray to have broken, as well as *tuppu damiqti* on which good works are written.[7] In the Old Testament Malachi refers to the book of remembrance that is written before Jehovah (III.16), and in the Talmud, *Pirqe Aboth,* II.1 reads: "Know what is above thee—a seeing eye and a hearing ear, and all thy deeds are written in a book." *Slav. Enoch* XIX.5 mentions the angels set over the souls of men "who write down all their deeds and lives before the Lord," while *Eth. Enoch* XCVIII.7 tells how every sin is every day recorded in heaven in the presence of the Most High.

The Qur'ān knows of this heavenly Record Book in which all that men are saying and doing is being written down (IX,120/121,-121/122; LIV.52; XLIII.19/18), nothing, whether great or small, being omitted (XVIII.49/47; LIV.53). This record is being kept

[7] Zimmern in Schrader's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament,* pp. 402, 405; Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien,* II.125; Martin, *Textes religieux babyloniens,* p. 256.

that Allah may recompense (IX.121/122; cf. *Eth. Enoch* LXXXI.4), and on the Last Day it will be brought forth that men may face their record (XVII.13/14,14/15,71/73; XVIII.49/47; XXXIX.69; LXXVIII.29) reminding us of familiar passages about the Books being opened for judgment in Dan. VII.10; Rev. XX.11-13; *Eth. Enoch* XCVII.6; XC.20. Some passages speak of Allah Himself doing the writing (III.181/177; IV.81/83; XIX.79/82; XXI.94; XXXVI.12/11 XLV.29/28),[8] but others speak of heavenly scribes occupying themselves with this recording of men's deeds (X.21/22; XLIII.80; L.17/16; LXXXII.11).[9] The verses LXXXIII.7,18 suggest that there were two books, one for the record of the wicked and one for the record of the virtuous, or if we are to think of individual tablets for individual persons as in Babylonian thought, then that the records of wickedness were kept in one place and those of virtue in another. Certainly they were individual records which on the Day of Judgment, it was thought, each person would receive in his own hand (XVII.71/73; LXIX.19,25; LXXXIV.7,10). This Record Book of the deeds of men is likewise referred to as a *kitāb mubīn* (XXXVI.12/11), a "book which makes clear."

In all this it is clear that we are dealing with religious concepts which had been circulating from very early times throughout the Near East, and which had doubtless had been part of the background of religious thought for most of the audiences that Muḥammad addressed during the course of his ministry. The fact that in his preaching he is able to assume that he is talking about matters with which his audience is already familiar is proof of this. Moreover, the verses that have been preserved as coming from the old Arab poets show that there was even literary use of these concepts contemporary with, even if not earlier than Muḥammad's ministry. He could therefore assume some familiarity on the part of his audiences with the idea of such heavenly writings as the Record Books of human deeds, the celestial Book of Inventory, and the great Book of Decrees.

---

[8] Since LVIII.22 speaks of Allah inscribing faith on the hearts of Believers the question arises as to how literally this writing of Allah is to be taken. Perhaps it was thought of both literally and figuratively. Jeremiah speaks of God writing His covenant on the hearts of His people (Jer. XXXI.33 quoted in Heb. VIII.10; X.16; cf. Job XIII.26 and Ps. LXXXVII.6), while the tablets of the Law were "written by the finger of God" (Ex. XXXI.18; Deut. IX.10). Both in ancient Egypt and in ancient Mesopotamia we find the picture of a deity who writes, so there was a long-existent tradition in this area for the notion of a God who literally writes, and we imagine that no one would have found anything strange in the fact that Sūra III.53/46 (cf. V.83/86) represents the disciples of Jesus asking Allah to write them down as those who bear witness.

[9] In the older religions we find that it was generally angels who did this recording. See *Ta'anith* 11 a; *Lev. Rabba,* xxii; *Test. Abrah.* xii; *Slav. Enoch* xix; *Apoc. Pauli,* 10, and for the Zoroastrian tradition *Dadistan-i-Dinik,* xiv.23.

But it would seem that his audience, or at least some of his audience, knew of yet another heavenly book. In XVII.93/95 the audience declares that they will not believe till he brings them down (from heaven) a *kitāb* which they may read. This is usually regarded as a Meccan passage, but if, as Dr. Bell suggests (*Qur'ān,* p. 262), it is Madinan, then it is explained by IV.153/152, where it is the Jews who challenge him to bring a heavenly book, and the answer is in VI.7, that even if Allah were to send down a book written on parchment which they could hold in their hands, they would say that he had but worked some magic trick and would not believe. To the People of the Book the idea of a man receiving a heavenly document written on parchment would not be strange. Ezekiel saw a celestial hand holding out to him a parchment scroll written within and without (Ezek.II.9), and the Seer in the Apocalypse had to take the little book that was in the hand of the angel (Rev.X.8-10), where since the Seer had to eat it we must assume that it was a book in the form of a scroll. In the story of Elchasai also the angelic visitant handed the Seer a "book." It is very interesting, therefore, to read in LXXIV.52, which is apparently an earlier Meccan passage, how the audience which turns away from Muḥammad's "Reminder" like startled asses fleeing from a lion, has the reproach levelled against it that each one of them wishes that he were the recipient of revelation in "sheets unrolled" *(ṣuḥuf munashshara),* where *ṣuḥuf* "sheets," "scrolls," "pages" would represent exactly what is pictured in the stories of Ezekiel, John and Elchasai. Now the revelation given to Moses is said in the Qur'ān to have been on *ṣuḥuf* (LIII.36/37; LXXXVII.18,19), the true Scriptures were in "sheets kept pure," (XCVIII.2, 3/2), and Muḥammad's own "Reminder" is said to be "in honoured sheets exalted, kept pure" (LXXX.11-14).

Here we approach something that is fundamental to the thought of Scripture in the Qur'ān. The *megillath sēpher* which was handed to Ezekiel was a heavenly book, but it was not Scripture in the sense that the canonical Book of Ezekiel is Scripture. Neither was the *biblaridion* of the story in the Apocalypse, though it was a book from heaven sent down to a man, a Scripture in the same sense that the Book of Revelation is Scripture. On the other hand the *biblos* of the story of Elchasai, whose ministry was in the midst of religious communities which possessed and revered Holy Books, was said to have been handed on by the founder to one of his disciples as a book of revelation, a book which Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* VI, 38, knows was used in the Elkesite community as a Scripture. Here the heavenly book has itself become a Scripture. This is quite a different conception of the nature of Scripture, and it is clearly this new conception which appears before us in the passages from the Qur'ān we have been considering.

At a very early period in ancient Mesopotamia it was believed that the gods might make known their will to mankind. This they might do through omens or signs or presages which skilled priests could interpret. Or they might make it known through dreams, as they did to that mighty king Gudea, or through the oracle. Shamash was "the Lord of the oracle." There were oracle priests trained to consult and interpret the oracle, and we have an abundance of oracle texts surviving from relatively early periods. In a prayer to Shamash we read:

> "To him who cannot see Thou providest light.
> Thou readest the hidden tablet that is not revealed.
> On the innards of sheep Thou dost write the omen
> And dost provide a decision."

If we interpret this aright it means that there were things written on the heavenly tablets to which man had no access but which it was important for men to know, and Shamash could and would enlighten men.[10] Revelations of this kind, however, were necessarily limited in scope. Often a fuller and more detailed expression of the will of the gods as regards men was desirable and was possible. One way of securing this desirable expression of their mind and will was by embodying their injunctions in a Code of Law, whose prescriptions would provide a practical *rule of life* whereby man could know how to live on earth the kind of life that would be most pleasing to the gods and most profitable to themselves. How early such Codes began to appear we cannot tell, but c.2500 B.C. we find Urukagina at Larsa[11] executing extensive reforms, removing abuses, issuing decrees "to restore the Law of God." The Code of laws was the writing of king Urukagina himself, but it was done, he tells us, under the inspiration of his god Ningirsu, so that the Code was ultimately a revelation of the prescriptions of God for the direction of men. Hammurabi also, it will be remembered, later set forth his more famous Code under the name and authority of Shamash.

Law in this sense is both prescription and instruction, in other words what the Jews meant by Torah. Now the Jews came to believe that the Torah was in written form with God long before the creation of the world, that its prescriptions were in part made known to and observed by Adam and the Patriarchs before it was revealed in its fullness by being brought down to Moses, and that it will be revealed anew when the Messiah comes.[12] Elchasai, we

[10] The text is in *Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts*, VI, 83. On Shamash as sun god and Lord of the oracle see Contenau, *La Divination chez les assyriens et les Babyloniens*, pp. 28 ff.

[11] On Urukagina see Patrick Carleton, *Buried Empires*, pp. 113-116.

[12] For the pre-existence of the Torah see *Gen. Rabba* VIII; *Midrash Tehillim*, ed. Buber, p. 391, and also pp. 449, 450, where it is deduced from Ps. CV, 8 that

know,[13] appeared in close association with the Jewish and Judaeo-Christian Ebionite communities of the Transjordan area, so that there can be little doubt that he, or whoever circulated the story about his "Book" received from heaven, had learned from them the idea that a Holy Book is something that was in heaven before it was sent down to be a Scripture for a community on earth. Are we then, to think that Muḥammad also had learned, directly or indirectly, from the Jewish communities of Arabia, to think of a heavenly Book of Scripture, a celestial archetype from which the various individual Books of Scripture among men derived?

Certain passages in the Qur'ān certainly suggest this. Sūra XIII.39 tells objectors that Allah can delete or confirm what He wills since He has there with Him the "Mother of the Book" *(Umm al-kitāb)*. This by itself might not mean more than that since Allah is the author of each special decree, He can confirm it or abrogate it as He sees fit. In XLIII.4/3, however, after a statement that this has been made an Arabic Qur'ān so that the Arabs may understand, we read: "And, behold! it is in the Mother of the Book in Our presence," a passage which it is difficult to understand otherwise than as a reference to a celestial archetype of the Qur'ān. Again in LVI.77/76ff. it is said to be "a noble Qur'ān in a treasured Book," and in XLI.41 the "Reminder" is said to be a "Book sublime" to which no falsehood comes either from before or behind, in both of which passages, though the reference could possibly be to Scripture as a whole of which the message of Muḥammad forms a part, it is generally taken to refer to the archetype. Finally in LXXXV.21,22 we read of "a glorious Qur'ān in a preserved tablet," which is the verse from which is derived the later legend of the Tablet on which the Divine Pen wrote when Time had just begun. The fact that "Qur'ān" in the above passages may mean "Scripture lesson" and not refer at all to the book we now have in front of us as a book, does not affect this question of the archetype from which Scripture is drawn.

If these passages mean that Muḥammad thought of such a heavenly original Scripture, a written word of God which was the origin of all Scripture, it would explain very neatly his insistance that the content of his own message was in Scriptures of former peoples (XXVI.196),[14] that his Qur'ān is both a confirmation of and a safe-

---

the Torah was in existence a thousand generations before it was revealed. For Adam and the Torah see *Sifre Deut.* § 41: *Gen. Rabba* XVI.5: *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer* XII. For the new Torah to be revealed by the Messiah see Alphabet of Rabbi Aqiba in Jellinek *Bet Hamidrasch,* III.27.

[13] Brandt, *Elchasai ein Religionsstifter,* pp. 11, 73.

[14] The word used here is *zubur* not *kutub,* but the use of this word *zubur* both for the record books of men's deeds (LIV.52), and for the books with which Allah's messengers were sent (III.184/181; XVI.44/46; XXXV.25/23), makes it

guard for previous Scripture (II.41/38, 91/85, 97/91; III.3/2 and V.48/52), so that those who accept previously revealed Scripture ought to accept his Qur'ān also (II.121/115; V.68/72). Thus it is easy to see why Muḥammad's followers are told that they are to believe in "the entire Book" (III.119/115), both what came to them through Muḥammad, and what had come through previous "messengers" (V.59/64. cf. XLII,15/14), and why the Scriptures brought by previous "messengers" are only a *portion* of the Book (III.23/22; IV.44/47, 51/54), just as what has come to Muḥammad is only a part of what is in the Book (XXIX.45/44; XXXV.31/28, and cf. II.231; XVIII.27/26).

This concept appears relatively late in Muḥammad's ministry. In particular the passages which may refer to an archetype seem all to be Madinan, coming from a period when he had been for some time in fairly close contact with the Jewish communities. If this is so it makes significant a number of small details we find in connection with his words about Scripture.

(a) As we have already noticed, the revelation given to Moses is said in LIII.36/37; LXXXVII.19 to have been on *ṣuḥuf*, "sheets," "scrolls." So in *Canticles Rabba* V.14 we read that though the Tablets of the Law were made of hardest stone they could nevertheless be rolled up like a scroll.

(b) The word used in LXXXV.22 for the "tablet" of the celestial archetype is *lauḥ*, the very word which is used in Hebrew and Aramaic for the tablets which Moses received at Sinai. Indeed it is the word used in the Qur'ān in Sūra VII.145/142 ff., in the story of Moses receiving the Law.

(c) Muḥammad seems to have thought of Moses receiving the whole of the Torah at Sinai. The Biblical accounts in Exod.XXXI.18 ff.; Deut.X.1-5, apparently mean us to think of the two tablets written by the finger of God as containing nothing more than the Decalogue, which would about fill two tablets written on both sides. Later Jewish accounts, however, spoke of the whole of the Torah being given there.

(d) Sūra XVII.93/95 speaks of an ascension to heaven in connection with Muḥammad's claim to have revelation material. Jewish legend told of Moses' ascent to heavenly places where he studied the Torah which he was to receive and deliver to the people.

There can be little doubt, therefore, that when Muḥammad came forward in response to his "call" he came to preach to audiences which not only had a knowledge of Scriptures being used as Holy Books by religious communities, but which, in some cases at

clear that it was used interchangeably with *kutub*. In LIV.43, indeed, *zubur* seems to mean "Scripture" in general.

least, were familiar with a definite theory as to the nature of Scripture, a theory which had grown up in the Jewish community and had already before Muḥammad's time passed from them to other communities. Clearly Muḥammad in his turn accepted from his contemporaries this theory, which he proceeded to develop in his own way as he worked out the implications of the mission to which his "call" had committed him.

Here then is the first fixed point in our discussion of the Qur'ān as Scripture. *Kitāb* as heavenly book was a concept that had had a long history in the religious thought of the Near East. *Kitāb* as Scripture had had a special development in Jewish thought and had given rise to a theory, current not only among Jews but also among other religious communities, as to the nature of Scripture. This theory is evidently basic to Muḥammad's teaching about Scripture in his Madinan period if not earlier, and would seem to have been taken over by him from the religious thought of his environment. The fact that it is an erroneous theory is for the moment irrelevant. The important thing is that it involved the idea of a progressive revelation.

(To be continued)

ARTHUR JEFFERY

Columbia University

George Hunter, Apostle of Turkestan. By Mildred Cable and Francesca French. London, China Inland Mission, 1948. pp. 107. Price 7/6.

George Hunter is an old-time friend, and was my inspiration during my lonely years in Arabia. He wrote two articles for our quarterly, THE MOSLEM WORLD, the first of which was on the Chinese Moslems of Turkestan (vol. 10, p. 168 ff.), the second on Islam in Northwest China (vol. 13, p. 203).

This is a missionary biography that is unique in its subject, its authors, and the back-drop of its magnificent and heroic drama. George Hunter was known as "the Scotsman of the Gobi," as "the Apostle of Turkestan," as the "Lonely Warrior," but none of these names measure his greatness or his character.

The twin spirits who are the authors are not only known by their earlier books, "The Gobi Desert" and "Through Jade Gate and Central Asia," but also personally met the subject of their biography while he was still on the outskirts of civilization. Their style is as vivid and fascinating as are the twenty-six photographic illustrations. The inside cover maps of Sinkiang, Mongolia, and Northwest China, enable the reader to follow this pioneer missionary in his wide pilgrimage journeys as Christ's ambassador.

George Hunter himself describes the character of this extensive and almost unoccupied mission field in a paragraph:

"This stretch of country is uninhabited," he wrote. "To the north are barren mountains, while to the south is forest land with long grass and bushes. It is really a wonderful country with winding rivers, marshy lakes and swampy meadows; the snow-bound mountains and glaciers sometimes rise to 24,000 feet, while some of the valleys and plains sink below sea-level. The deserts are cold in winter, but burning hot in summer. The many towns and villages stand in areas of rich land where grain, fruit and vegetables are grown in abundance, but they are divided by jungles, forests and stretches of arid land."

Only such a man as George Hunter, of iron will and iron frame and rigid principles could have endured the constant hardship of pioneer effort in a field so extensive and so difficult. In one respect his character was like his field:

"George Hunter, from first to last, was reckoned by his fellow missionaries to be a difficult man to live with. He knew no compromise in matters of what he was pleased to call "principle," but which others viewed as merely his personal outlook on life. In the old days of the Lanchow bachelor establishment, that interesting little community was often subject to upheavals in which he was the storm-centre, and his words or actions the occasion of outbursts of plain speaking."

He was a puritan and a Presbyterian of the old school. He never made a compromise with the Roman Catholics, until toward the end of his life God's Providence put George Hunter and a Roman Catholic priest in one Soviet prison cell for more than a year. We do not know what the talk of those two men during their long and dreary months of torture was, but we may believe that the other side of George Hunter was revealed, for he was a man with a loving heart; a broken-hearted bachelor as devoted to Christ alone as Francis of Assisi. Here is a tragic page from his life story. After his

first eleven years of hard toil he was unwillingly sent home to Aberdeen on his first furlough.

"He did not enjoy the time, but endured it until he could return to China. To him, as to many another missionary, furlough proved to be a period of opening up old wounds, of compulsory recalling of buried comradeships, and of facing those whom he would fain forget. In his young days he had loved a woman with all the intense devotion of which his Scotch heart was capable. The day came when she was taken ill and died at the early age of twenty-two. She asked that the New Testament which he had given her, and all his letters to her, should be buried with her. This was done, and George Hunter was left desolate and alone. It was then that he dedicated himself to missionary work, and Jessie and all that concerned her was buried deep within his heart."

Yet he, with his own hands, built a marker (on the grave of the woman whom he still loved) of great granite stones in the shape of a heart.

The simplicity of his character is evident throughout the whole story. Unpretentious, unassuming, he was nevertheless brimful of all kinds of first-hand knowledge. He knew Christ and men and the desert; and his travel equipment was simple but effective for his purpose of exploration. He never owned a camera or a typewriter. He had no brilliant linguistic gifts, but could converse in a half dozen languages of the dialects of Central Asia. The passport he carried was written in Chinese, Kazaq, Turki and Mongolian, and he travelled most generally alone. His headquarters were the town of Urumtsi, but the limits of his parish extended nearly a thousand miles southwest to Kashgar, and nearly twice as far into Northwest China to the Great Wall. He seldom remained at his headquarters, except when unable to be on the road with books and Bibles, preaching his message. We read in his journal of one of his many longer journeys, "Altogether we were away 75 days and travelled 1,000 miles on horseback."

For many years after he returned from his first furlough, he lived absolutely alone. Then he had a companion, Percy Mather, also of the China Inland Mission. These two indefatigable travellers knew that the only way to get their message over was to carry it themselves along the highroads and the byways. The Soviet Government was antagonistic, and the control of travel permits became more and more acute. They carried with them Scripture portions in all the many languages of Central Asia, and everywhere they found real acceptance of the books, including of course Chinese and Arabic for the Muslims of Central Asia. Whether among Mongols or Tibetans, their best passport was human kindness and a desire to serve.

He built his own three-room house at the beginning of his career, and there he received some of the great world travellers, including Aurel Stein and Ellsworth Huntington of Yale. Only a few hours ago a reporter of one of the New York dailies had afternoon tea with us in New York. He said he had been for seventeen years a correspondent in China, and was delighted to see this biography of George Hunter, whom he discovered many years ago in the desert of Gobi resting at a water hole!

Except for his one furlough and two visits to Shanghai, one of which was to a great missionary conference, George Hunter never left his post. He died in the land which he loved, on December 20,

1946. The news came from the Kanchow post office to his friends in these words, "The aged pastor is dead. He breathed his last a few moments ago."

Many of the places where George Hunter witnessed are now closed to Gospel messengers, and the saddest story in this most interesting biography is that told in the introduction about his long imprisonment under accusation of being a British spy. He was torn from his home at Urumtsi after all efforts through torture had failed to make him confess any guilt. No word of politics had ever passed his lips in that country. The last five years of his life were made hideous by the persecutions of the secret police, who set a watch upon his house and finally kept him in jail; here he suffered untold misery at the hands of the N.K.V.D. When writing later of this unspeakable ordeal, George Hunter said:

'The injections which were given in order to reduce my will-power told upon me and made resistance more difficult, and had they continued much longer I might have said that I was a spy.' From that time he understood why the accused always pleads guilty in a Soviet criminal court."

The story of such a life of heroism and final martyrdom does not end in the last chapter. The corn of wheat sown in the soil of Central Asia will yet bring forth fruit that shall shake like Lebanon, and the inspiration of this life comes as a challenge to our present generation to occupy all of Central Asia.

SAMUEL M. ZWEMER

New York City

Mohammedanism, An Historical Survey. By H. A. R. Gibb. London, Oxford University Press, 1949. pp. 206. $2.00.

This little book by the Laudian professor of Arabic at Oxford is by this reviewer's estimate wholly commendable as "an historical survey" and as vol. 197 in the Home University Library of Modern Knowledge. It made delightful reading at one sitting. Islam is herein epitomized by a sound, recognized scholar in adequate control of the vast area to which he has addressed himself. There is a neat balancing of ten justly proportioned chapters, eight of which, running from Mohammed to the Sufi orders, rest between a first on The Expansion of Islam and a last on Islam in the Modern World.

It is, of course, a handy volume, one in which the seasoned student of Islam can find full satisfaction, and one to be put confidently into the hands of new students who seek perspective and of any members of the general public who might wish to lay it by for ready reference (it is well-indexed). The old hand at things Islamic will notice as he reads many a deft touch and frequent examples of keen insight (which even the new student may not miss), e.g., Muhammad's "outstanding political genius is shown by the way in which Mecca was finally incorporated"—"of its own volition" (p. 29); "the Koran sways between the conceptions of predestination and free will, according to whether the relevant verses are addressed to the unheeding multitude or to the group of Believers" (p. 40); "characteristic Muslim compromise" (p. 50); "for the early Muslims there was little or no distinction between 'legal' and 'reli-

gious' " (p. 89); "the establishment of an orthodox system was thus a gradual process" (108); and "the weakness of organized groups is their proneness to stress the collectivity rather than the individual and to value social solidarity above personal devotion" (189). Chapter 7 on Orthodoxy and Schism is unusually discerning and discriminating, including "new light" and favorable on the previously disparaged Mu'tazilites. A minimum of technical terms is used and usually exact transliteration of the original forms of words,—except that Mohammed, Koran, Moses and others appear in popular form.

The little book might fit into the thinking of many a man of religion today who realizes the play of "forces which have been undermined, or threaten to undermine, all theistic religion" (p. 188). That is, Islam has occasion to review its own tradition in the light of just demands from modern science (cf. p. 181f.), even as it falls to other faiths. There is an "essence of the Islamic faith and ethic" which may be preserved by the "most enlightened Muslims" amidst all necessary change (p. 191). Is there not an essence of enlightened faith which man must exercise and cherish if he would be whole?

JOHN CLARK ARCHER

Yale University

The World of the Middle Ages. By John L. LaMonte. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1949. pp. xxi, 827. $5.50.

The sub-title of the late Professor LaMonte's new history of the Middle Ages, *A Reorientation of Medieval History,* draws attention to one feature of the book which distinguishes it from most of its forerunners. In his own words, "Instead of Western Europe, Germany, and the Papacy, which are usually stressed, the Byzantine Empire and the Moslem Caliphates have been made the central theme in the present treatment of the Middle Ages." His adoption of this new perspective, following a trend already exemplified by Moss in *The Birth of the Middle Ages* and by Henri Pirenne, is especially welcome to students of the Muslim civilization, who have long deplored the onesidedness and lack of balance displayed in, for example, the *Cambridge Mediaeval History* and most general works on the subject.

Performance, unhappily, does not quite measure up to the promise of these hopes. It was hardly to be expected that, in a survey covering well over a thousand years, any particular subject would be discussed in more than general outline. Even so, an allotment of twenty-four pages to the whole of Muslim history from 600 to 1055, although supplemented by two pages on economic aspects, five on intellectual aspects, and three pages on the Saljuq states, scarcely differs from the proportions observed by earlier writers.

But there is more serious cause for disappointment than this. Professor LaMonte's exposition of Muslim history is itself based largely on outline works. The first consequence of this is that Muslim history is presented in the flat, without bringing out the relative significance of events and their relation to general issues; the second, that there is a liberal sprinkling of errors, varying from small points of detail and excessive foreshortening (as in the paragraph on the Quraish (p. 94) or on the subject of Persian and Cop-

tic converts (p. 104)) to misstatements of such magnitude that I forbear to give them publicity here. In the two pages devoted to the Fatimids (114-6) no indication is given of the economic rehabilitation of Egypt under their rule—a capital event in the history of the Middle Ages—but half a page to the reputed eccentricities of al-Ḥākim. Similarly, the paragraphs devoted to the Saljuqs (pp. 330-3) show no appreciation of the revolution which they initiated in the whole fabric of Western Asia. As against these weaknesses, however, the account of Muslim intellectual culture (pp. 237-241) is admirably done in spite of extreme compression. The Bibliography (pp. 771-2) omits the most important recent work for the guidance of students, J. Sauvaget's *Introduction à l'histoire de l'Orient musulman* (Paris 1943).

H. A. R. Gibb

History of the Arabs. By Philip K. Hitti. Fourth Edition Revised. London, Macmillan & Co., 1949. pp. 767. $9.00.

Each new Edition of Professor Hitti's *History of the Arabs* is an improvement upon its predecessor and affords added credit to its author. This fourth Edition contains emendations and additions which make it worth while for libraries and teachers to replace any former Edition they possess with this one and for others to insert the changes and new material in the copies they already own. The changes would not have been made if the author had not considered them to be valuable.

Professor Hitti has given us our most comprehensive summary of Arab and Islamic history from its beginning in the earliest dealings of Arabia with its neighbors down to the advent of the Ottoman Turks as the champions of Islamic lands. His readers will be glad to know he is working on the continuation of his *History*. Prof. Hitti has also provided his Western readers with the most appreciative introduction to Arabic literature and culture, from their origin with Muhammad and the Qur'ān until after the Crusades.

Prof. Hitti has so cordially welcomed and used suggestions in the past that another is offered here.

More than once the first part of the Muslim creed, *lā ilāha illa 'llāhu* has been rendered, "no god but Allah." Should not the full force and meaning of the Arabic generic negative be expressed in English for the non-Arab by some such translation as, "There is no god at all but Allah"? Non-Muslim readers would like to know also that both sentences of Islam's short creed are Quranic.

E.E.C.

The Arabs: A Short History. By Philip K. Hitti. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1949. pp. 224. $3.00.

This is the fifth revised edition of a condensation of Hitti's *History of the Arabs,* made by Mr. Byron Dexter in collaboration with the author and first published in 1943. It is not for sale outside of the Western hemisphere.

In the revision of this shorter work, addressed not to the scholar

but to the general reader, Prof. Hitti has made the changes that have attracted his attention and approval. He has also added a chapter on "The Arab Lands in the Modern World."

The result of this scholarly spirit increases the duty and pleasure of the reviewer in recommending this new Edition.

E.E.C.

Arabs, Oil, and History. By Kermit Roosevelt. New York, Harper & Bros., 1949. pp. 271. $3.50.

Kermit Roosevelt has the happy faculty of winning friends for the Arabs by recounting in a chatty and informal manner his adventures in the Middle East in recent years. In an informal and anecdotal style the reader is introduced to the peoples and institutions of the part of the world where Oil looms as the most important economic factor today. Fortunately the point of view is realistic rather than blindly admiring.

The often rather sketchy survey of the entire region from Turkey to Aden and from Afghanistan to Egypt whets one's appetite, to say the least. After a series of generalizations about the land and the people, nine short chapters cover the ten major countries of the region. Finally comes an attempt to summarize the roles of Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union in the Middle East.

Mr. Roosevelt has had an unusual opportunity to observe the Middle East. Travelling as a historian, a State Department representative, a wartime intelligence officer, and as a correspondent for American magazines he has made friends with the great and the near great. These include Qashqai tribesmen in Iran, Pashas and Islamic scholars, desert nomads and King Ibn Saud, greatest living Arab leader. There is no doubt that the author has great respect for sturdy old Ibn Saud and what he has done for his people. However, all through the book one senses the insecurity of the traditional ruling cliques in the face of mass poverty and misery. Proper credit is given to the impact of American ideas and the direct as well as indirect education that has come with the arrival of oil exploitation in the region. Aside from that he has few kind words for the American oil companies.

The most important chapter deals with the Palestinian situation. The dangers of political Zionism are made crystal clear, whether within Palestine or outside its borders. "The arguments of the Zionists," he believes, "constantly provided ammunition for the anti-Semite. The emotions and fears aroused over Palestine may be turned by unscrupulous men against Jews everywhere."

Mr. Roosevelt's effort to tell the story of the Muslim religion in nine pages leaves quite a bit to be desired. He shows dramatically in the account of the American Army officers' trip to Jidda the tragedy of our not knowing the rudimentary customs of Islamic society. Certainly any reader who expects to travel in the Middle East will wish to do more study of Islam before setting sail to this crossroads of the world.

On the whole, *Arabs, Oil and History* provides a satisfactory and thoroughly readable introduction to the problems of the Middle East, complicated as they are from within by social, economic, and

political contradictions and tensions and bombarded from without by the pressures of Great Power rivalries.

HERRICK B. YOUNG

New York City

The Government of Ethiopia. By Margery Perham. New York, Oxford University Press, 1948. pp. xxiii, 481. $6.50.

Ethiopia, until recently so isolated from the rest of the world that it has been called the hermit empire, has in the last few decades been the subject of many books by historians and travellers. Margery Perham, of the University of Oxford, and regarded as one of the greatest experts on Africa and colonial affairs, has in her book *The Government of Ethiopia* made an extensive study of the important books on Ethiopia since the Napier Expedition to Ethiopia of 1868 and of the more recent works dealing with Ethiopia after liberation from Italian conquest.

After dealing with the topography and geography of the land the ancient history of this interesting old country, by tradition the land of the descendants of the Queen of Sheba through a son born to her from King Solomon of Israel, is interestingly related. The transition of the religion of the land from animism to Christianity in the time of the Axumite Kingdom in the fourth century A.D. explains the present background of Christianity.

The rise to power of Tafari Makonnen, from Prince to Ras to King, and finally to King of Kings or Emperor under his baptismal name of Haile Selassie is described in detail. The internal organization of the empire, the relationship of Emperor Haile Selassie to the various sub-kings and lesser rulers in the land is presented in more detail in this work than in any other volume heretofore published.

The Church of Ethiopia, a branch of the Coptic Church of Egypt, is a powerful force in the land, even though the clergy seems to touch "chiefly the external observances of religion rather than its spiritual content." Foreign missionaries have been urged to concentrate on non-Christian elements of the population instead of seeking to convert Ethiopian natives from their own (Coptic) form of Christianity.

Law and justice, the army, the economic condition of the country, public finance, slavery, health and education are all treated in a most satisfactory manner. The Emperor Haile Selassie, while yet only known as the Regent Tafari Makonnen, had used his authority in an ever increasing manner toward the abolition of slavery. The proclamation of 1924 specified that all slaves born after that date were automatically free; slaves were automatically freed on their master's death; and the purchase and sale of slaves was forbidden and a slave proving he had been sold was entitled to freedom. This law would mean the wiping out of slavery within one generation without any economic upheaval or Civil War as was precipitated in enlightened America in 1861.

Any student of Ethiopian affairs will find this book by Margery Perham a mine of information. It is not a volume of light reading which can be perused in an evening, nor are all the chapters written

so interestingly that one must finish the book in one sitting. It is rather an authoritative treatise evidencing vast study of most available sources. One weakness of the book is the fact that the author has not had personal contact with the Emperor Haile Selassie and Ethiopia. She has travelled in the territories surrounding Ethiopia, and has lived for a time upon its borders in British Somaliland, trekking from there into the neighboring part of Ethiopia, but has not dwelt among the ruling class people or visited Addis Ababa, nor lived among the Ethiopians so as to feel the pulse beat of the people. One must know Haile Selassie in some measure to be able to treat with full charity concerning the great issues with which he has to deal daily, to sense the deep underlying love for his people and devotion to his religion and to see in him one of the great Christian gentlemen of our generation. Your reviewer has lived in Ethiopia six years as a medical missionary and can testify to the deep sincerity of Haile Selassie in all the reforms he has initiated in his country amid almost insuperable obstacles.

STUART BERGSMA, M.D.

Grand Rapids, Michigan

Southeast Asia—A Crossroad of Religion. By Kenneth Perry Landon. The Haskell Lectures in Comparative Religion delivered at the University of Chicago, 1947. University of Chicago Press, pp. 215. $4.00. Also Cambridge University Press, London, and W. J. Gage & Co. Ltd., Toronto, Canada.

In this publication Dr. Landon has made available a fund of valuable information on the historical, social and religious background of the people living in the area included in Southeast Asia. Before the Second World War there was available but little accurate information published in English concerning the life of the people in this area. There has been a plentiful supply of books having their setting in this section of the world but they have been largely fictional and sensational and thus of little historic value. Due to conditions brought on by the war a new interest has been aroused on the part of the west in the people of Southeast Asia. This book is therefore very timely and will be appreciated by those desiring accurate information concerning the interesting people living there.

The first few chapters give an interesting and revealing account of the influences coming from China, India and the islands of the Pacific to mingle with the primitive customs and superstitions of the people native to the Southeast Asian area. The influences coming out of China are more dominant in Indochina and to a lesser extent in Malaya and Indonesia. Indian influence introduced by the teachers of Buddhism and Hinduism has molded the life patterns of the Indonesians, Siamese and the Burmese especially. The Muslim conquest coming later into Malaya and Indonesia has produced a people who devoutly profess the faith of Islam, but who still retain many of the practices which were introduced by the Hindu conquerors. Other native customs which represent the survival of the primitive ceremonies of an animistic people are given new importance by being set to Muslim ritual.

The author has given a very interesting account of the changing patterns of social life which accompanied the Hinduization and

later the Islamization of the Malayan and Indonesian portions of the area concerned.

In the last chapter of the book Dr. Landon gives an absorbing description of the manner in which western influence is changing the outlook of many of the younger generation by the introduction of western machinery and household appliances, western clothing and western social customs. This change is being hastened by the large number of prominent young people who have gone to Europe and America to complete their education. Yet it must be remembered that those so influenced represent but a small percentage of the total population. The mass of the people still have the mental outlook of nature's children and continue many primitive practices in spite of the westernization process.

In the judgment of the writer of this review based on rather close contact with the Bataks of Sumatra during a period of over twenty-five years he would say that the author's observation regarding the Batak Christians accepting the forms of Christianity but retaining their old pagan customs while covering them with a Christian cloak (pp. 184f) does not correspond with what he has found to be the general practice of the present generation of Toba Batak Christians. If the author's reference is to the first generation of Toba Batak Christians there could be but little objection made to the reference.

It is recognized that in dealing with a subject which has so many angles and ramifications a much larger volume would be required to give a complete picture, tracing the flow of religious influence and national life and customs through the cross currents of Southeast Asia, yet Dr. Landon has rendered a distinct service to the cause of Christian missions and to the students of Comparative Religion in having brought within such a volume a concise and authentic view of the inner life of the interesting people living in Southeast Asia.

Raymond L. Archer

New York City

Hispano-Arabic Poetry and its Relations with the Old Provencal Troubadours. By A. R. Nykl. Baltimore, Maryland, J. H. Furst Company, 1946. pp. xxvii, 416.

The author, who is one of the foremost centemporary authorities on Hispano-Arabic poetry, has summarized his studies in this fine volume. It is especially valuable for three reasons: first, it is the first handbook in English of the whole field of the subject; secondly, it is based on sources to be found in Spain; thirdly, it opens up new perspectives as to the connections of Hispano-Arabic poetry with the poetry of the Aquitanian troubadours.

The book begins with a succinct historical survey of the Spanish Umayyads. Then there follows a detailed analysis of the historical development of Hispano-Arabic poetry. Each chapter opens with a short characterization of the period in question, followed by concise biographies of the poets and extracts from their characteristic poems in excellent versified English translation.

In the amirate and khalifate period (756-1020 A.D.) Hispano-Arabic poetry first modeled itself on Eastern pattern and tradition,

but soon developed, under the influence of its new home, into poetry of love and joy. In the *Mulūk aṭ-ṭawā'if* period (11th century) three poets are particularly discussed in detail, one being Ibn Ḥazm and his *Ṭauq,* the other Ibn Zaidūn whose long *qasīda* in *nūn* is translated in full, and the third al-Mu'tamid. In the al-Moravid period (1095-1149) Abū Bakr ibn 'Abdalmalik Ibn Quzmān receives a very long appreciation. From the literary production of the last two periods, the al-Mohad (1149-1248) and the Granada (1248-1492) periods, a large number *muwashshaḥas* and *zajals* are quoted.

The concluding Chapter VII treats of the relation between Hispano-Arabic poetry and that of the first Aquitanian troubadours. Starting with an ingenious comparison between Ovid and Ibn Ḥazm, the author points out that the art of Arabic poetry known as *muwashshaḥa* and *zajal* was originated in al-Andalus. He dismisses the old theory that the Franks would have been unable to understand Muslim poetry. On the contrary, "if the Franks of Spain and France could imitate the Muslims in warfare, dress and other habits, it is idle to deny that they imitated them in music and singing" (p. 381). The author shows in typical examples the similarities of metre and rhyme between both poetries. Old Portuguese lyrics, especially the *Cancioneiro da Ajuda,* also displays a striking resemblance with Hispano-Arab love poems.

The copious notes appended to each chapter contain a complete topical bibliography of the subject.

A. R. Nykl's excellent work has the double merit of being a comprehensive repertory of the researches made into a very fertile field of Arabic studies and, at the same time, a guide to further investigations. It has also the double merit of being a learned textbook for the Orientalist and an exquisite Hispano-Arabic anthology for the non-Orientalist general reader. And no one can be better equipped for writing such a work than the author whose credo is that "poetry is *the essence of history* and of *true human culture*" (p. 400).

JOSEPH SOMOGYI

Budapest, Hungary

Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume. Part I. Edited by Samuel Löwinger and Joseph Somogyi. Hungary, Budapest, 1948. pp. 434 plus 41 (Hebrew section). $8.00.

In a letter published in the *Moslem World,* July 1947, Professor Joseph Somogyi commemorates the twenty-fifth anniversary of the death of Ignace Goldziher (1850-1921), the great Hungarian Arabist, and promises the early appearance of a memorial volume. The first part of that volume has now appeared, and it is a worthy tribute to Goldziher's fruitful career. The co-editors, Professor Joseph de Somogyi and Professor Samuel Löwinger, both of Budapest, are to be thanked for the care and discrimination with which they have assembled, edited, and printed a truly international document. Scholars from three continents have contributed significant studies on a variety of Semitic subjects to make up the thirty-four articles of Part I. Part II is promised in the near future. The reviewer can examine here only a representative portion of the vol-

ume; it is hoped that the remainder may make the subject of a further review.

Surveying swiftly the history of Israel among the great powers of the ancient near East from the time of Sargon II (722-705) to that of Nabonidus (556-538), Dr. Samuel Löwinger (the Jewish Seminary, Budapest) offers a new approach to the second chapter of the Book of Daniel. He rejects equally "the Macabbean dogma" and the theory that the "five kingdoms" refer, as a *vaticinium ex eventu,* to the successive monarchs of the Second Babylonian Empire and the triumphant Cyrus. In their place he offers the view that Daniel as a historic personage did prophesy the future for Nebuchadnezzar, and that the second chapter of our present book represents the remains of his prophecy (as modified by subsequent writers in the stream of later events, of course). "Daniel," he says, "really succeeded in 'guessing' the purport of the dream by means of divine inspiration." On such a psychological base, Dr. Löwinger constructs a new interpretation of the dream (Dan 2.32-35) and its interpretation (Dan 2.36-45). Nebuchadnezzar dreams of the growth and overthrow of the Assyrian Empire; Daniel, prophesying *ante eventum,* parallels the fate of Assyria with the coming fate of the Chaldeans. This theory, while an ingenious one, does not do too much violence to the facts as we have them, and succeeds in recognizing that parts of the early chapters of Daniel stemmed from venerable historic traditions. The problem of Daniel will never cease to fascinate.

Dr. Löwinger's collaborator, Professor Joseph Somogyi, in his article "Adh-Dhahabī's Record of the Destruction of Damascus by the Mongols in 699-700/1299-1301," makes a valuable addition to the documentation of that mournful era of Islam. Drawing upon B.M. MS. Or. 1540, fols. 123-34, he gives both an appreciation and a translation of the document. The works of C. Mouradja d'Ohsson and Sir Henry Howorth on this period are based on various Arabic, Persian, and Armenian authorities (which Somogyi enumerates), but to them he adds the detailed eye-witness reports of the famous Damascus scholar, adh-Dhahabī. As Somogyi points out, this new source "is a valuable contribution to the history of the Mongol invasion of the caliphate and, at the same time, a true description of the conditions of Damascus at the end of the 7th Century A. H." The translation of the document seems to communicate something of the swiftness and objectivity that the original Arabic must have possessed.

"Two practical questions dominated men's minds in the first two centuries of Islam, the seat and function of authority, and the definition of the faith." With these two questions in mind, Professor William Thomson of Harvard University reviews some of the salient points of belief of a number of early Islamic sects, notably, the Shi 'ites, the Murji'ites, and the Kharijites. Noting the tendency of some western scholars to find political motives behind sectarian divergences of doctrine, Professor Thomson maintains that the "beliefs, attitudes and actions of these sects flowed naturally from their fundamental conception of religion. . . ." Such historic facts as the Caliphate and the civil wars served to bring to a head and give particular direction to divisive doctrinal points of view, which would have manifested themselves in some fashion whatever the course of history might have been. For the basic suppositions of the

three major sects which he discusses may be paralleled in other religions. He says: "For the early Shi'ites religion meant to acknowledge the divinely appointed Imam, or, again, the one in whom God dwelt or appeared. . . . Salvation meant finally deification. For the Murji'ites religion meant to be in communion with God in love and lowliness of heart and to win salvation through faith, in short to know God. For the Kharijites religion meant to live according to God's revealed law" (p. 115). It is good that the growth of religious sects be not considered in a purely political or social light.

Joseph Aistleitner (Budapest) makes a detailed case study of the position of Ugaritic in the consonantal shift out of primitive Semitic into the derived languages. He concludes from the consonantal stability of Ugaritic that it is more closely related to North-Arabic and South-Semitic than to Northwest- and East-Semitic. The Rev. Eric F. F. Bishop of Jerusalem writes of the various words in Hebrew, Arabic, and Greek, used to express the epithet "blessed" as applied to the Deity. He concludes from his study that the expression "was Semitic before it was Hebrew or Islamic." He contrasts the variety of usage of the expression in the Old Testament with the comparatively stereotyped usage of the Qur'ān, and comments on the few references in the New Testament as "finally bringing to bear on the very doctrine of the revelation of God in Christ the riches of its inheritance in εὐλογητός." Arthur J. Arberry (Pembroke College, Cambridge) contributes a brief description and appreciation of "The *Kitāb al-Badī'* of Ibn Khālawaih" (d. 980), one of several works by this author on the orthography of the Qur'ān, which has providentially come to light in the MS. collection of A. Chester Beatty.

Professor Paul Kahle, writing on "The Qur'ān and the 'Arabīya," gives notice to two hitherto unused MSS. (in the Chester Beatty collection), which shed considerable light on the reading of the Qur'ān in the early years of Islam. After assessing the work of Vollers, Nöldeke, Bergsträsser, and Pretzl in this field, Professor Kahle turns to the two MSS.: al-Mālikī's *at tamhīd fi ma'rifat at-tajwīd,* and the considerations of al-Farrā' on the language of the Qur'ān. From these he derives details on early traditions concerning the reading of the Qur'ān, some of which may go "back to the methods used by the Prophet himself."

With a succinct and valuable historical summary of critical views from 1889 to the present, Professor H. H. Rowley of Victoria University, Manchester, England, re-opens the vexed question of "The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah." Expanding a suggestion of Maurice Vernes that "Nehemiah belonged to the reign of Artaxerxes I," while "Ezra, if he was indeed a character of history, belonged to that of Artaxerxes II," the Belgian scholar Van Hoonacker between 1890 and 1924 developed a cogent set of arguments for the reversal of the conventional order. Professor Rowley demonstrates how Van Hoonacker's view has steadily gained support in spite of the unanimous refusal of German scholars to accept it, and of the detailed argument of other scholars against it. These arguments are examined to arrive at the conclusion that Van Hoonacker's theory of Nehemiah's priority is the most probable solution of the problem yet advanced, "with the exception that the Belgian scholar needlessly supposed that Ezra had also been in Jerusalem

with Nehemiah on the latter's second visit to Jerusalem, many years before he began his own mission in 397 B. C." Professor Rowley's full documentation of late continental scholarship will be welcomed by some of us who have suffered from the interruption of the war years.

As a final item in this necessarily brief review I should like to mention the article of K. V. Zetterstéen (Uppsala), "The Oriental Documents in the Swedish State Archives," as an interesting commentary on the great barrier of language which the world faces in its search for understanding and unity. He was asked in 1932 to prepare a catalogue of the unpublished Oriental documents in the State Archives at Stockholm; the present article reviews something of the course of his work on this project, offering representative extracts from the official diplomatic notes of Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco to the Swedish government. These documents are a mine of detailed information concerning political and economic conditions in North Africa during the 18th and 19th centuries. The cumbersome machinery of translation which had to be improvised by Swedish, Turkish, and Arabic speakers is well illustrated.

Space precludes even a listing of the many other articles of this significant volume. It may be hoped that the pattern of international cooperation so bravely set here in this time of unrest and mounting barriers between nations will do its modest part in turning back the forces of division and misunderstanding that are at work among us. Only by such free intercourse among scholars can the truth be discovered and defended.

Ford Lewis Battles

The Hartford Seminary Foundation

Introduction to the History of Science. Volume III: Science and learning in the fourteenth century. In two parts. Published for the Carnegie Institution of Washington by the Williams & Wilkens Company, Baltimore, 1947, pp. xxxv, 1018; Part 2, 1948, pp. xi, 1019-1871. General Bibliography; General, Greek, Chinese and Japanese Indexes, pp. 1872-2155. $20.00.

Volume I of this work, dealing with the beginnings of human science had as part of its title, "From Homer to Omar Khayyam." Volume II, in two parts, covers the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries of our era.

The whole work is not a history of the world up to the Fifteenth Century of the kind which describes the nations and peoples of the earth with their rulers and dynasties, their wars and conquests and the rise and fall of governments. Rather it is a history of human knowledge throughout the world. It deals with the aspects of life and thought, nature and universe as presented to man under fourteen general categories. These are Historical and Religious backgrounds of each half century; The translators; Education; Philosophical and cultural background; Mathematics and astronomy; Physics, technology and music; Chemistry; Geography; Natural history; Medicine; Historiography; Law and sociology; Philology.

The Volumes give a descriptive account of the status of science and learning, with biographical and bibliographical details of the authors and books that preserved, increased and handed down knowledge under fourteen categories.

The books provide more than a chronicle of the growth and extension of science. It is a feature of this cultural history of mankind that it is really world-wide in its scope. Wherever there are records of knowledge, there Dr. Sarton has delved and reported. The first, the various and the changing statements of men about nature, man and the divine he has recorded. He has endeavored to ascribe to each thinker the first perception or the clearest expression of truth of thought and external reality. It is indeed the attention to these advances in valid knowledge that give the whole work its most distinctive character.

Dr. Sarton has divided each century into halves and describes the status of the culture of each period. He shows where in the world the greatest amount and activity in learning existed and mentions who and what contributed most to the advance of knowledge in each age. The result is a unique and amazing history and encyclopaedia of the intellectual life of humanity. It was wise and just of Dr. Cyrus Adler to say, at the meeting of the American Oriental Society at Philadelphia in 1938, that Dr. Sarton was producing the greatest work of scholarship ever done on the American continent.

In this history of the past, Dr. Sarton has not confined his account of any subject to the amount of knowledge existent at the time of which he is writing. Rather, to the mention of the books and authors concerned with those subjects up to that period, he adds the names of the later publications that provide information about those books and authors. Frequently this is done by a simple reference to ISIS, the journal of the History of Science Society, both of which Dr. Sarton founded. The journal, of which the latest issue is Number 121, supplements and, where possible, amends the information of the *Introduction,* and provides an invaluable, not to say necessary companion to the History of Science.

Dr. Sarton spent nine years of labor for Volume I of his *Introduction,* thirteen more for Volume II and twenty-seven for Volume III. He does not plan to continue the work. The task is too great and would take too long. It is hoped, however, that a committee or group of scholars, under the auspices of some learned society or institute or university, will carry on this *Introduction to the History of Science,* adopting Dr. Sarton's plan and standards. It is also to be hoped that the volumes already published will be made available in some abbreviated form for wider use among those interested in the culture of the past. These three volumes record the March of Science and Learning in Ancient and Mediaeval Times. Already they provide in summary for the general reader the story of the progress of knowledge in the fourteen comprehensive categories. If these summaries, perhaps somewhat revised and expanded, were put into one volume, they would probably find wide popular acceptance, without detracting from the value of the whole work for the scholar and specialist.

It is in place here to mention something personal for Dr. Sarton. In the Preface to this third Volume, Dr. Sarton says that in 1943 he lost his old friend and first Arabic mentor, Dr. Duncan Black Macdonald. I should like him to know that I remember Dr. Macdonald telling me that he counted his association with Dr. Sarton and his work as one of the greatest satisfactions of his life.

EDWIN E. CALVERLEY

From the Quarterly Newsletter of the Society of Friends of the Moslems in China for July 1949, the following interesting account of visits to the mosques in Kunming is quoted:

"Since Kunming has long been considered one of the key centers of Islam in China, no difficulty was encountered in planning profitable tours. We first attended the Friday noon service at the leading mosque and were very cordially received by its leaders. After telling them of our conference, they offered suggestions and extended invitations thereby providing us with an agenda for further trips. Their invitation to the local theological seminary resulted in an extremely interesting two hours in which we were not only graciously entertained by the leading Moslems of Yunnan but also given an enlightening lecture on the *Five Pillars of Religion* in the life of the devout Moslem. In fact, for a while during this lecture one began to wonder just who was doing the evangelizing—Moslem or Christian! (But let it be hastily added that in the two weeks following this 'Clinic', the Moslem who expounded the *Wu Kung* so eloquently has been reading a Bible and engaging in long, thought-provoking discussions with a missionary and Chinese pastor.) From this seminary another invitation led us to an Arabic school for women at a mosque not far distant. Since this mosque was in a predominately Moslem area we had ample opportunity to become acquainted with the basic characteristics of Moslem food-shops. The desire to taste as well as see soon found us winding up several field-trips with most satisfying visits to Moslem restaurants for the noon-day meal. On the final trip within the city we attended a service at Kunming's largest mosque and had the unexpected privilege of witnessing the worship in a small women's mosque on the same compound. This trip likewise took us to the large, well-built Middle School run by the Moslem community, and there we met some of the teachers, one of whom had been trained at Al Azhar in Cairo. By this time the Moslems of Kunming (approx. 3000 families) became aware of our interest and visits, and two weeks later we heard that the folks at the East Gate mosque were still waiting for us to visit them too. . . . . ! Unfortunately we had been unable to fit in a visit to this more distant mosque. All in all, it was felt that these field-trips provided us with a pattern of conduct that might easily be reproduced in many a Moslem area in Yunnan. It is amazing to note what doors of opportunity can be opened provided there is a prayerful effort made in a spirit of friendliness. No door was closed to us."

Plans of the American University of Beirut

"A major effort to increase essential knowledge of the Arab World in the United States has been undertaken by the American University of Beirut, Lebanon, through a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation for an Institute of Arabic Studies.

"The grant to cover a period of three years, it is hoped, will lead to a permanent center for American research into contemporary

Arab life and a liaison between American students of social and political science and the Arab countries.

"Part of the grant will be used to establish an essential library of basic materials and the balance for salaries and the costs of developing relations with other centers of contemporary Arabic studies. The interpretive studies to be made by the scholars are expected to serve as a foundation for a better understanding of the Arab world, according to Dr. Stephen B. L. Penrose, Jr., president of the University.

"A cooperative arrangement now is being worked out with Dr. Philip Hitti, head of the Department of Oriental Languages and Literatures of Princeton University, so that graduate students in the Arabic field may take part of their work in Princeton and part in Beirut. They will receive full credit for their overseas courses." Quoted by permission from the *Bulletin of the Near East Society,* for September, 1949.

Hindustan's Muslim Millions

No living man knows exactly how *many* millions there are. In *The Muslim World* for April 1948 (p. 98), Dr. D. M. Donaldson, Principal of the Henry Martyn School of Islamic Studies at Aligarh, India, said that "forty-five million Muslims still remain in the Indian Union," while the Rev. J. D. Brown of the same School stated in *The Muslim World* for July 1949 (p. 194): "There are some thirty-five million Muslims in the Indian Union." That there should be ten millions difference between the two estimates (possibly in light of later knowledge) is not surprising when we recall that even the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru himself, told a New Delhi Press Conference according to an Associated Press report: "The last census was hopelessly wrong, because . . . . separate electorates led to complete falsification of the census, for separate electorates offered a strong inducement to the average person to tell a lie"; and in support of his opinion he said, "the Statistical Society which was an authoritative body, conducted a survey of the population of Bengal four years *after* the 1941 census and found the population was six millions less," even four years after, "than the 1941 census figure." The Pundit added: "The figure of four hundred million" for all India "was all wrong." The census report itself made two interesting disclosures concerning the methods of the 1941 census which robbed the official figures of any real value, viz., *first,* instead of present religious profession being asked in the census forms, each person was asked his or her tribal origin or connection. This factor alone was sufficient to invalidate many returns, for what is needed is not past origin but present beliefs. The *second* vitiating factor was what the census report itself called 'random samplings' whereby only one-fiftieth of an area was tabulated in detail. This method of 'random samplings' adopted as a war economy to reduce the number of census workers, whereby the figures of a large area were decided on the basis of signed papers in only one-fiftieth of the area, may be approximately correct concerning a religion like Hinduism found everywhere in India, but not with a religion of smaller numbers and the growth of which has

differed so greatly in various sections of the country. These imperfect methods, the result of war-time pressure, probably affected both the Muslim and the Christian figures, for the Christian population of India showed little change if any on the figures of 1931 which were 6,296,763 Christians, whereas the late Dr. William Paton held the 1941 Christian population of India was 'about eight millions,' and some Indian Christian leaders held that Mission reports of the preceding decade showed the correct figure to be about nine millions. It is clear from the foregoing that an even approximately correct figure for the number of Muslims in the new Hindustan will have to wait for the next census which normally will be in early 1951, and it is to be hoped that no further war, either in India or out of it, will rob the statistical returns of trustworthiness.

J. F. Edwards

Auburndale, Mass.

SURVEY OF PERIODICALS

By Sue Molleson Foster
Union Theological Seminary Library

I. GENERAL

The Oriental Institute. Thorkild Jacobssen and John A. Wilson. (In the *Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* Chicago. July, 1949. pp. 236-247).

Gives a history of thirty years' achievement and plans for further development.

Some Recent Works on the Near East. Harry N. Howard. (In the *Journal of Modern History,* Chicago. March, 1949. pp. 35-43).

Evaluates books, chiefly in English, dealing with the Arab world and Zionism.

The Treasures of Ksar 'Akil. J. Franklin Ewing. (In *Thought,* New York. June, 1949. pp. 255-288).

A thorough study of the light thrown on Stone Age man through excavations made in a Lebanese valley from 1937 to date.

Works on the Far East and Central Asia published in the U.S.S.R. Rudolf Lowenthal. (In the *Far Eastern Quarterly,* Wisconsin. February, 1949. pp. 172-183).

A bibliography.

II. ARABIA

A Further Journey across the Empty Quarter. W. Thesiger. (In *The Geographical Journal,* London. June, 1949. pp. 21-46).

Tells of experiences crossing the Rub' al-Khali desert in 1947-1948.

Two Notes from Central Arabia. H. St. J. B. Philby. (In *The Geographical Journal,* London. June, 1949. pp. 86-93).

A description, with map, of the Pools of Aflaj and the Qariya ruin field.

III. HISTORY OF ISLAM

Les Études Historiques en Turquie de 1940 à 1945. R. Mantran. (In *Journal Asiatique,* Paris. Vol. 235, 1946-1947. pp. 89-111).

An annotated bibliography.

"The Lesson of Palestine." Musa 'Alami. (In *The Islamic Review,* Woking. June, 1949. pp. 42-44).

The closest coöperation must exist among the Arab countries to foster political unification and social and economic reform.

New Turkey's First Twenty-five Years. K. M. Smogorzewski. (In *The Contemporary Review,* London. December, 1948. pp. 326-330).

It is expected that the democratic gains will be observed in fair elections in 1950.

IV. KORAN. TRADITION. THEOLOGY

A Forgery in al-Ghazālī's Mishkāt? W. Montgomery Watt. (In the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,* London. Part 1-2, 1949. pp. 5-22).

Argues that the "Veils section" of the *Mishkāt al-Anwār,* so contradictory to al-Ghazālī's general position, is either a forgery or a substitution.

Penal Laws in Islam. Maulana Muhammad 'Ali. (In *The Islamic Review,* Woking. June, 1949. pp. 7-11).

Describes laws for murder, adultery, theft, etc.

A Popular Life of Nadir. Raphael Patai. (In *Edoth,* Jerusalem. April-June, 1948. pp. 1-20).

A translation of an interesting account of the folk-life of Nadir Shah (1688-1747).

The Transmission of Muslim's *ṢAḤIḤ*. James Robson. (In the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,* London. Part 1-2, 1949. pp. 46-60).

Accompanied by a detailed chart, the article traces the collection of tradition through Al-Nawawī, Abū Bakr b. Khair and Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Shalāhī.

V. RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL LIFE

Une Assemblé de Village en Pays Kabyle. (In *Ibla,* Tunis. 1948, trimestre 3-4. pp. 283-299).

A translation from a Berber text.

Couture. J. Ballet. (In *Ibla,* Tunis. 1948, trimestre 3-4. pp. 373-376).

Gives general observations on Tunisian women, especially those living on farms.

Le Problème du Travail en Tunisie. A. Demeerseman. (In *Ibla,* Tunis, 1948, trimestre 3-4. pp. 237-281).

A careful study of the basic economic and social aspects, with some suggestions for a solution.

Progress in Egypt. Mary Rowlett. (In *The Contemporary Review,* London. December, 1948. pp. 339-343).

The author notes particularly the growth of a spirit of service and self-sacrifice.

A Sketch of the Ethical, Social and Political Position in Transjordan, Syria and Iraq. Francis W. Anderson. (In *The Eastern Churches Quarterly,* London. April-June, 1949. pp. 97-117).

A stimulating presentation.

Tisseuses et Tissages Decorés d'el-Djem et de Djebeniana. M. L. Golvin. (In *Ibla,* Tunis. 1948, trimestre 3-4. pp. 33-56).

Describes the life led by Tunisian artisans as well as the technical methods they employ.

Women and Feminism in Egypt. M. Perlmann. (In *Palestine Affairs,* New York. March, 1949. pp. 36-39).

Tells of the slow progress being made by Egypt's ten million women toward social recognition and economic improvement.

The Women of Pakistan. Begum Liaquat Ali Khan. (In *The Asiatic Review,* London. July, 1949. pp. 726-728).

Gives an account of the work done with myriads of refugees, the development of a National Guard and the political activities of the Women's Muslim League.

VI. POLITICAL RELATIONSHIPS

Les Algériens à Tunis. Germaine Marty. (In *Ibla,* Tunis 1948, trimestre 3-4. pp. 301-334).

An analysis of various groups.

France, England and the Arab States. Robert Montagne. (In *International Affairs,* London. July, 1949. pp. 286-295).

A strong plea for united action by Great Britain, France and the United States to secure peace in the Near East.

Geography and Politics in the Nile Valley. Douglas D. Crary. (In *The Middle East Journal,* Washington, D. C. July, 1949. pp. 260-276).

Discusses Anglo-Egyptian relations in the Sudan.

Jews and Moslems in their Popular Beliefs. Judah Bergman. (In *Edoth,* Jerusalem. April-June, 1948. pp. 35-65).

The author finds the resemblances far greater than the differences.

Switzerland and its Relation to Islam. Dr. H. Marcus. (In *The Islamic Review,* Woking. June, 1949. pp. 26-28).

Compares Calvinism and Islam and reviews the work of Johann Ludwig Burckhardt, the first Swiss Muslim.

L'USSR et L'Islam. Jean Comtois. (In *Politique Etrangère,* Paris. Decembre, 1948. pp. 457-472).

Analyses Soviet propaganda in the Arab world and concludes that unless Arab leadership improves Lenin's prediction of Communism gaining the West through the East may well be realized.

Who Secured the Suez Canal Shares? J. W. Robertson Scott. (In *The Quarterly Review,* London. July, 1949. pp. 336-347).

An historical article discussing the relative importance of the work of Disraeli and of Frederick Greenwood, editor of the "Pall Mall Gazette," in gaining the Canal for England.

VII. INDIA AND PAKISTAN

India, Pakistan and Burma To-day. Sir Percival Griffiths. (In *The Asiatic Review,* London. July, 1949. pp. 652-668).

Expresses optimism over India and Pakistan, but is hopeless about Burma, which, the author fears, is going to be a prey to Communism—thus endangering all of South East Asia.

Pakistan. Sir William Barton. (In *The Quarterly Review,* London. July, 1949. pp. 298-311).

Despite border uncertainties and the unrest over Kashmir, Pakistan on the whole is making substantial progress.

Pakistan and the Tribes. (In *The Round Table,* London. September, 1949. pp. 329-336).

An account of North-West Frontier problems with the hope that the Durand Line, established by the British, will be maintained.

THE PUNJAB FRONTIER FORCE. Gen. Sir Rob Lockhart. (In *The Asiatic Review,* London. July, 1949. pp. 668-683).

A history of a hundred years of service.

THE TEA INDUSTRY IN INDIA AND PAKISTAN. Arnold Whittaker. (In *The Asiatic Review,* London. July, 1949. pp. 639-651).

A résumé of the work in Assam where an annual crop of almost six hundred million pounds is gathered.

A TOUR OF INDIA, PAKISTAN AND CEYLON. Gen. Albert Orsborn. (In *The Asiatic Review,* London. July, 1949. pp. 689-702).

The author, leader of the Salvation Army, found a tolerant, humanitarian spirit throughout his trip, but the refugee problem is staggering.

THE YOUNGER GENERATION IN THE THREE DOMINIONS. Colin Jackson. (In *The Asiatic Review,* London. July, 1949. pp. 684-688).

The story of the encouraging impressions received by three British university students on a debating tour through India, Pakistan and Ceylon.

VIII. MISSIONS TO MUSLIMS

CHRIST IN AN ARAB STATE. S. G. Thicknesse. (In *The Church Times,* London. September 9, 1949. pp. 590).

The author finds a great deal of tolerance based on principle and pride among the Muhammadans.

CHRISTIANS AND ISLAM IN THE NEAR EAST. G. D. (In *The Eastern Churches Quarterly,* London. April-June, 1949. pp. 118-124).

A plea for Christians to show Christ in their lives, particularly where they come into contact with Islam.

ISLAM'S IMPACT ON CHRISTENDOM. (In *Catholic Missions,* New York. August-September, 1949. pp. 4-8).

Stresses the work of the White Fathers in Africa.

THE RELIGIOUS FUTURE OF JERUSALEM. The Rev. James W. Parkes. (In *The Hibbert Journal,* London. July, 1949. pp. 328-334).

The three monotheistic faiths should make sure that the "Holy City" becomes a spiritual force in the world and not just a "museum of the dead past."